

THE
Church of England

Evidently proved a Member of the
Holy Catholick Church:

herein the Doctrine of *ARIANS*,
SOCINIANS, and *ANABAPTISTS*, are Answered and Confuted; and the *PRESBYTERIANS* proved Schismaticks.

With some Reasons of the Reverend
Dr. *Tillotson* against Persecution
meerly for Religion.

P. B. formerly of the Order of St.
Francis, now a Convert to the Church
of England.

L O N D O N:

Printed for the Author, and sold by
Benj. Crayle at the *Peacock* and *Bible*
at the West-end of *St. Pauls*. 1687. *JG*

THE
Church of *England*

Prov'd the
Holy Catholick Church.

THe *Roman* Church appropriates this glorious Title to her self only; thunders Anathema's against all other Churches whatever; calls them Hereticks, and Schismaticks; declares, unless they unite themselves with her, they are without any hope of Salvation;
B uses

uses a thousand subtilties to draw them to her Communion; deceives and frightens the simple and ignorant, making them believe, that out of her there is no Salvation; offers great rewards to the learned; persecutes them that will not be either corrupted with fat Preferments, or deceived and frightened with several Fables, wherewith they are entertain'd; deprives them of their Estates, and Employments, &c. and forces them to forsake their Country, as the poor Protestants of *France* are now necessitated to; either causing them to be burnt alive, or inflicting several

veral other cruel torments upon them, as it is at this time the Custom in *Italy* and *Spain*.

I confess, that the *Roman* Church was not always cruel. I grant that in the Apostle's time, and first Ages, I mean, when they observed the holy Scripture both in its Practice and Doctrine, they could justly boast of this glorious Title, *Holy Catholick*. But since they were corrupted, and have diminished from, and added unto the holy Scripture several points of Faith, which they impose upon us, under pain of Damnation; and since they are fallen into Heresie, they

have lost this fair and glorious Title : These words, *Holy Catholick*, cannot be justly attributed unto them; it is the Church of *England* which now most justly and gloriously possesses these honourable Qualities.

But as women that have lost their honour, & are grown debauch'd, when they quarrel with them that are honest and vertuous, are used to call them Whores first, lest that villainous and odious name should be cast upon themselves; so the Church of *Rome* having lost the fair qualities of *Holy Catholick*, and being fallen into Heresie, is wont
every to

to call the Church of *England* Heretical, lest she should justly reflect upon her, that which she falsely accuses her with.

I will not go about here to prove that the Church of *Rome* is Heretick; I have done it already, *per argumentum ad hominem*; that is, by their own Principles, in a small Treatise so intituled. Those who have the Book, and have read it over, are fully convinced of it; and those that have it not, if they desire to have it, may be satisfied, as soon as they are pleased to acquaint me with their laudable intention. Wherefore I shall here make it e-

B 3 vident,

vident, that the Church of *England* is the *holy Catholick Church*, which being proved, (there being but one *holy Catholick Church*) it will appear that the Church of *Rome* hath lost this glorious and noble Title.

But before I make it appear, it will be necessary rightly to understand the words, *Church, Holy, Catholick*.

The word, *Church*, is usually taken, either for the place, where people are gathered together to pray and worship God ; or else for a Congregation of humane Persons professing the Christian Faith, where-
of

(7)

of Jesus Christ is the foundation, *For other Foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ*; and though the Apostles and the Prophets be also termed the Foundation, yet Jesus Christ himself is the chief corner Stone, in whom all the Building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy Temple in the Lord.

1 Cor. 3.
11.
Ephes. 2:
19, 20, 21.

We accept the word *Church*, in this latter sense; wherefore by the Church, we understand a Body or Collection of humane Persons, professing the same Faith in Christ, gathered together in several places of the World, for the

Worship of the same God.

The Church thus described may be called *Holy* in several respects, and for several Reasons. First, In reference to the Vocation, by which all the members thereof are called, and separated from the rest of the World to God; which Separation in the Language of the Scriptures is a Sanctification, and so the calling being holy (*for* 2 Tim. i. 9. *God called us with an holy calling*) the Body which is thus separated and congregated may well be termed *Holy*. Secondly, In relation to the Offices appointed, and the Powers exercised in the Church, which by their

their Institution and Operation are holy. Thirdly, In reference to the Saints departed from this life, and admitted to the presence of God ; and of this Church speaks St. Paul, when he saith, *Christ loved the Church,* Eph. 5 25, *and gave himself for it, that* 26, 27. *he might sanctifie and cleanse it, by the washing of Water by the Word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy, and without blemish.* Fourthly, In respect of every Person, who is a member of that Church ; because in professing Faith in Christ, he is thereby engaged to

holiness of life, according
to the words of the Apo-
stle, *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ, depart from iniquity.*

2 Tim. 2. 1.

The Church that we are speaking of, and call holy, is that that embraces all the Professors of the true Faith of the holy Scriptures, when they are in this World; which Church comprehends good and bad, being both externally called, and professing the same Faith; for the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a Field, in which Wheat and Tares grow together into the Harvest: Like unto a Net, that was cast into the Sea, and gathered of every

Mat. 13.

24, 30.

every kind. *Firmissime tene & nullatenus dubites* Fulgent. ad Petr. c 43.
aream Dei esse Ecclesiam Catholicam, & intra eam usq;
in finem seculi frumento mixtas paleas contineri, hoc est, bonis malos Sacramento-
rum Communionem misceri;
 that is, Hold this most firmly, and doubt not of it in any wise, that the Catholick Church is a Floor, and that therein, (as long as the World shall stand) Wheat and Tares together shall be contain'd, that is to say, that the bad and wicked shall be mingled with the good and just in the Communion of the same Sacraments. This is that Ark of Noah, in which were preserved
 ved

ved Beasts, clean and unclean; This is that great house, in which there are not only vessels of Gold and Silver, but also of Wood and Earth, and some to honour, and some to dishonour.

Therefore when we speak of the *Holy Church*, we do not consider her in respect of the Vocation, which is holy; neither of the Offices and Powers, which likewise are holy; nor in reference to the Saints departed this Life, and enjoying the presence of God; nor in relation to the Persons, who compose the Church in this Life, since in that respect the
Church

Church comprehends both good and bad; but in relation to the Doctrine taught therein, which is pure and holy, and without blemish.

The Church thus described is also called *Catholick*, that is, *universal*; which word is used in our Creed, to teach us to discern the true Church from the false. The word, *Catholick*, may be taken either in reference to time, or relation to places, or in respect of Persons; or else in reference to Doctrine. It is here taken in respect of the Doctrine only; so that by the *Catholick* or *universal* Church, we mean, that
Church

Church that teaches and believes the whole Christian Doctrine. For as the Holy Ghost did lead the Apostles into all truth, so did the Apostles leave all truth unto the Church, which is called *Catholick*, from the universality of necessary and saving Truths contain'd therein.

This being granted, it follows, that that Church which embraces the Faith once delivered to the Saints, and keeps the holy Scriptures in Purity, without adding to, or diminishing from them, is the holy *Catholick Church*; for whatsoever Church pretendeth to be holy *Catholick*,

tholick, and keeps not the whole Faith once delivered to the Saints, and imposes things to be believed, which are not found, neither can be deduced from the Scriptures by evident and necessary Consequences, (as the Church of *Rome* doth) falsely attributes this name to her self. Since then the Church of *England* keeps the Faith once delivered to the Saints, preserves the holy Scripture in its Purity, and imposes nothing to be believed, but what is therein distinctly contained, or can be deduced therefrom, by evident and necessary Consequences, it follows, that she
is

is the holy Catholick.

Read over the Old and New Testament, and if you can make it appear, that the Church of *England* believes or practises one point of Faith, which is not contain'd in the holy Scripture, or doth not believe or practise those Articles of Faith, which are contained therein, (as too often the *Roman* Church doth) then I will grant freely, that she is not the holy Catholick ; bnt no body being able to make this appear, I am in the right, in asserting the Church of *England* to be the holy Catholick Church. 'Tis certain, they do not make unto themselves any graven

graven Images ; nor worship, kiss, and serve them ; neither bow, pray, and offer Incense unto them.

They do not make Images of God the Father in the shape of an old man, holding the Globe of the World in his hands, nor of the Holy Ghost in the form of a Dove, nor of the Cross, and do not worship them (as the Church of *Rome* doth) with a Worship of λατρεία, that is, with a Worship due unto God only.

They do not believe in any other Saviour and Redeemer than Jesus Christ ; they hold him for their only Mediator and Advocate, and they will not put
their

their trust and confidence
 in any other. They do
 not believe any other Pur-
 gatory, than the Blood of
 Jesus Christ; nor believe
 that the Pope with a little
 Indulgence laid unto a
 Bead, or Cross, or Medal,
 or with a Mass said upon
 certain days of the week,
 is sufficient to procure a
 release to the Souls of men
 detained in torments,
 wherein, to fill his Trunks
 with Money, and to fatten
 his Kitchen, he would make
 ignorant People to believe,
 they are imprisoned. They
 do not believe that he is
 Infallible; that he hath a-
 ny Power to depose Kings
 and Princes from their
 Throne,

Throne, to dispense their Subjects from their Allegiance, or to kill those that he calls Hereticks. Neither do they believe that Christ's Body is still upon Earth; they believe and put it in practice, that we are bound to sing, pray, and give thanks to God Almighty in a known tongue; they believe they ought to give the common People the liberty of reading the holy Scriptures in their own Tongue. They give the Sacraments of Christ's Body and Blood with Bread and Wine; give leave to eat Flesh at all times; do not forbid Bishops, Priests, and those which

1 Tim. 4.

which are in orders to marry, knowing that such a Doctrine is the Doctrine of Devils ; they add nothing to, nor diminish from the holy Scriptures, as the Church of *Rome* often doth, therefore it is clear, that the Church of *England* believes the whole Christian Doctrine, as it was once delivered to the Saints, and consequently, that she is the *Holy Catholick*.

Object. The Church of *England* believes in the *Trinity* ; but the word, *Trinity*, is not found in the holy Scripture ; therefore the Church of *England* believes a point of Faith not
con-

contained in the Word of God, therefore she is not the holy Catholick, for as you said before, to give the denomination of holy Catholick to any Church, it is requisite, she should believe the whole Christian Faith, as it was once delivered to the Saints, without any addition to, or diminution from the holy Scriptures.

Ans^w. Though that word, *Trinity*, be not found in the holy Scriptures, yet the thing signified thereby, is found therein; as it appears by the words of *Matthew*, *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father,*

Mat. 28.
29.

ther, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And more evidently by those of the
 1. Joh. 5.7. first of St. John : There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. That Consequence therefore is not good, which saith, that the Church of *England* is not the holy Catholick, because it believes in the Trinity, that word not being express'd in the holy Scripture ; for provided the thing signified be found there in equivalent terms, or may be deduced from thence by clear and necessary Consequences, 'tis sufficient, and mat-

matters not, if the word it self be not expressed. But as I have just now made it appear by the Texts of Saints, *Matthew* and *John*, the Trinity is there very clearly expressed, therefore, &c. But you may further urge that by the word, *Trinity*, we mean three eternal and infinite Persons, really distinct one from another, subsisting in one Nature numerically; but this is contrary to Reason, and is not found in the holy Scripture, nor can be deduc'd from it by clear and necessary Consequences; therefore it may be rightly inferr'd, that the Church of *England* is not the

the

the holy Catholick Church, it believing a point of Faith, which is neither found distinctly, nor in equivalent terms in the holy Scripture.

Probatur minor, First, That the Trinity is contrary to humane Reason, which is proved thus. For as it is contrary to humane Reason, that *Peter, Paul,* and *John*, who are three distinct Persons, have but one Nature Numerically, seeing that every Person hath its Nature different from th'other, if not in *Specie*, at least *Numericè*, and it cannot be otherwise; so it is contrary to Reason, that the Father, Son, and Holy

Holy Ghost should be three really distinct Persons, and notwithstanding, have but one nature *Numericè* ; which can't be, since from three Persons do naturally follow three substances or natures ; which is proved thus. Person in God is either a being, or nothing ; we can't say that it is nothing, because the three divine Persons should then be nothing at all, therefore it must be a Being : If Being, either it is real or mental ; we can't call it mental, because *sublato Intellectu*, the Persons should be no more ; therefore it remains that it is a real Being ; if real, either it is a Substance.

or an Accident ; there being no *Medium* between Substance and Accident. We can't say that it is an Accident, because we do not admit any in the Godhead, for the great Absurdities which follow from thence ; therefore it must be a Substance ; and if a Substance (since there are three really distinct Persons) it follows, that there are also three really distinct Substances, which is contrary to Reason.

Secondly, That the Trinity is neither found distinctly, nor in equivalent Terms in the holy Scripture, is easily proved. The former is without any contradiction,

tradiction, for if ye read
 over the holy Scripture, ye
 shall no where find the
 word, *Trinity*. And the
 matter is proved thus. If
 the Trinity be therein e-
 quivalent terms, it is ei-
 ther in this Text, *Go ye and
 teach all Nations, baptizing
 them in the name of the Fa-
 ther, and of the Son, and
 of the Holy Ghost*; or else
 in this, *There are three that
 bear Record in Heaven, the
 Father, the Word, and the
 Holy Ghost*; and these
 three are one. For, though
 in the one and th'other
 mention be made of the
 Father, Son, and Holy
 Ghost, and consequently,
 of three Persons, because

the Father is a Person, the Son a Person, and the holy Ghost a Person; yet we cannot infer that these three Persons have but one nature or substance *Numericè*; for although some infer it from that word, *in the Name*, which is in the singular number, yet that is not convincing, since I may say, such a thing is commanded in the Name of the King, and his Chancellor, and yet, though that word be in the singular Number, we can't infer, that the King and his Chancellor have but one nature *Numericè*.

Neither

Neither can the Trinity be inferred from these words of St. *John*, *and these three are one*; because, by that Unity we may very well understand a Unity of Will, Agreement, and Spirit, and not of Nature or Substance; so that, when 'tis said, *there are three that bear Record, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one*; It is the same thing as to say, these three are one in Will; do agree one with another; what one Will's, the other willeth also. And this is confirmed by the words of St. *John*, wherein Jesus Christ prayeth his Father that we may be one, as he

Joh. 15. 21

is one with his Father ;
 that is, that we may do
 what he will have us to do,
 as he doth what his Father
 will have him to do. Every
 body may see clearly
 that we are not, nor can
 be one in nature, *Numericè*,
 with Jesus Christ, it being
 contrary to Reason; there-
 fore we cannot infer by a
 clear and necessary Conse-
 quence, that the Father,
 the Son, and the Holy
 Ghost have but one nature
 or substance, *Numericè* ;
 therefore the Trinity is
 neither found in the holy
 Scriptures distinctly, nor
 can be deduced from them
 by evident and necessary
 Consequences.

First,

First, I answer thus. I must confess with all learned men, that the Mystery of the Trinity is above humane Reason; that it can't be comprehended in this World by any Creature whatsoever. We may sooner reckon the Sands of the Sea, the Leaves of Trees, than understand that glorious Mystery; for how can we apprehend one and the same thing, to be one, and yet many? How can we apprehend that one and the same Essence may be begotten, and yet unbegotten; that one and the same thing was from all Eternity, and yet was truly and properly begotten?

This is above humane Reason. Therefore the Angel, in a form of a little Boy that brought a Spoonful of Water from the Sea, and poured it in a little hole, did answer *Austin*, who was meditating upon the Mystery of the Trinity, he asking him what was his intention, that his design was to put all the Water of the Sea in that little hole. But *Austin* replying, that that was impossible, the Sea being so vast, and the hole so little, the Child answered, that he should do that sooner than he could comprehend the Mystery of the most holy Trinity. *Deum esse Trinitatem*

nitatem credimus potius Aug. lib. 15. de trin.
quàm videmus. That is,
 we rather believe than see
 that God is Trinity. And

Thomas Aquinas saith, *im-* Tho. Aquinas. q. 32. ar. 1. in conclus.
possibile est per rationem na-
turalem ad cognitionem Tri-

nitatis divinarum Persona-
rum pervenire ; quia homo
per rationem naturalem in
cognitionem dei pervenire
non potest nisi ex Creaturis;
Creaturæ autem ducunt in
Dei cognitionem sicut effe-
ctus in causam. Hoc igitur
 solum ratione naturali de
 Deo cognosci potest, quod
 competere ei necesse est secun-
 dum quod est omnium enti-
 um principium. Virtus au-
 tem Creativa Dei commu-
 nis est toti Trinitati, unde

This is above humane Reason. Therefore the Angel, in a form of a little Boy that brought a Spoonful of Water from the Sea, and poured it in a little hole, did answer *Austin*, who was meditating upon the Mystery of the Trinity, he asking him what was his intention, that his design was to put all the Water of the Sea in that little hole. But *Austin* replying, that that was impossible, the Sea being so vast, and the hole so little, the Child answered, that he should do that sooner than he could comprehend the Mystery of the most holy Trinity. *Deum esse Trinitatem*

nitatem credimus potius Aug. lib. 15. de trin.
quàm videmus. That is,

we rather believe than see
 that God is Trinity. And

Thomas Aquinas saith, *im-* Tho. Aquinas. q. 32. ar. 1. in conclus.
possibile est per rationem na-
turalem ad cognitionem Tri-

nitatis divinarum Persona-
rum pervenire ; quia homo
per rationem naturalem in
cognitionem dei pervenire
non potest nisi ex Creaturis;
Creaturæ autem ducunt in
Dei cognitionem sicut effe-
ctus in causam. Hoc igitur
 solum ratione naturali de
 Deo cognosci potest, quod
 competere ei necesse est secun-
 dum quod est omnium enti-
 um principium. Virtus au-
 tem Creativa Dei commu-
 nis est toti Trinitati, unde

pertinet ad unitatem essen-
 tia, non ad distinctionem
 Personarum; per rationem
 igitur naturalem cognosci
 possunt de Deo ea quæ perti-
 nent ad unitatem essentia, non
 autem ea quæ pertinent ad
 distinctionem personarum.
 That is, It is impossible by
 natural Reason to come to
 the knowledg of the Trinity
 of divine Persons; because
 by natural Reason we cannot
 come to the knowledg of God,
 but by Creatures, which lead
 us to the knowledg of God,
 as effects to the Cause.
 Therefore by natural Reason
 that only may be known of
 God, which by necessity be-
 longs to him, as he is the
 principle of all things. But
 the

the Power of creating in God is common to the whole Trinity, therefore it belongs to the unity of Essence, and not to the distinction of Persons. We may then by reason know the things belonging to the unity of the Essence of God, but not the things belonging to the distinction of Persons.

Secondly, I answer, That though it be contrary to Reason, that *Peter, Paul, and John*, who are three distinct Persons, have but one nature *Numericè*; nevertheless it doth not imply, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, who are three really distinct Persons, have but one

na-

nature or substance *Numerice* : For it is otherwise in divine than humane Persons. And although Person in God be a real being, and consequently (being really taken) a Substance; yet it doth not follow, because there are three really distinct Persons, that there are three Substances really distinct one from another. For God being an intellectual Being, he knows himself to be infinitely Perfect, and knowing himself to be so, he loves himself : The term of his Intellect is called the Son, as we call the Holy Ghost the term of his love. but it is not so with the term of the Intellect
and

and Love of God, as with the term of the Intellect and Love of men, because this is an Accident, that a Substance; I say, a Substance; because no Accidents can be found in God, as it is the consent of all Writers; therefore since the term of the Intellect of God, and the term of his Love is a Substance, and since one is call'd the Son, and the other the Holy Ghost; it follows (since three Substances cannot be in God, because it would import three Gods, which is contrary to the nature of God, to Reason, and to the Holy Scriptures,) that they have but one and the same Sub-

Substance, as it is taught both in the Symboles of *Nice*, and *Athanasius*.

Thirdly, I answer, That though the Trinity be not found distinctly in the holy Scripture, yet it may be inferred from thence by clear and necessary Consequences. And though the two Texts of St. *Matthew* and *John* before mentioned, be not sufficient to convince the Reader, since they may be explained as they are in the Objection; nevertheless, the essential Attributes of God, as his Eternity, Immensity, Omnipotency, Creation, Conservation of the World, Sanctification of Souls, Resurrection,

urrection of the Bodies, Prayer and Worship being equally attributed to the three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, (as it may be seen in several places of the holy Scriptures, and I will shew in the sequel of my Discourse,) it follows, by an evident and necessary Consequence, that they are God, and therefore that they have but one substance or Nature *Numericè*, which is called *Trinity*.

Obj. The Church of *England* believes that the Son is *Consubstantial* with the Father; but the word, *Consubstantial*, is not found in the holy Scriptures; there-

therefore the Church of *England* believes an Article of Faith, which is not in the word of God; therefore she is not the holy Catholick Church.

Answer, Though that word, *Consubstantial*, be not read in the holy Scriptures, yet the thing signified and meant by that word, is found therein. For when we say and believe, that the Son is Consubstantial with the Father, we mean that he hath one and the same Substance with his Father, which is inferred from the holy Scripture by clear and necessary Consequences; for these words of St. *John*, *I*
and

and my Father are one, do Joh. 10. 13
 signifie nothing less than
 the Son hath an unity of
 Substance with his Father;
 for if had only an unity of
 Will, of Mind, and A-
 greement, as the *Arians*,
 and several other Persons
 in *France, England, Hol-*
land, &c. do believe at this
 time, he should not be cal-
 led in the holy Scriptures,
the only begotten Son of I John 5.
God, the true God, eternal 20.
Life, and God blessed over Ro. 9. 5.
all for ever. Heb. 1. 3.
 He should not
 be called *the brightness of*
the glory of his Father, and
the expresse Image of his Per-
son; and we should not
 read of him that *he being* Phil. 2. 6.
in the form of God, thought
it

it not robbery to be equal with
God ; he should not be cal-

Rev. 1. 8. led *Alpha* and *Omega*, the
beginning and the ending,
which is, which was, and
which is to come, the Al-

Col. 2. 3. mighty. Or that In him
are hid all the Treasures of
wisdom and knowledg, and

Col. 2. 9. that In him dwells all the
fulness of the Godhead bodi-
ly. We should not read,

Col. 1. 16. that By him were all things
17. created that are in Heaven,
and that are in Earth visi-
ble and invisible, whether
they be Thrones or Domini-
ons, or Principalities, or
Powers ; and that All things
were created by him, and
for him, and that he is be-
fore all things, and by him

all

all things consist; and that
He upholds all things by the Heb. 1. 3
word of his Power; and as Joh. 5. 21.
the Father raiseth up the
dead and quickens them,
even so the Son quickens
whom he will; Neither
should we read, that He
knows the hearts of all men, Joh. 5. 23.
and that All men honour
the Son, even as they ho-
nour the Father; and that
All the Angels of God wor-
ship him; and that Four Rev. 4.
and twenty Elders fall down 10. 11.
before him, and worship
him, and cast their Crowns
before the Throne, saying,
Thou art worthy, O Lord, to
receive Glory, and Honour,
and Power, for thou hast
Created all things, and for
thy

thy pleasure they are, and were Created.

Now since by these Texts of the holy Scriptures, ye see that the Name of the true God, which cannot be proper to a Creature, is not only ascribed to the Son, but also all the essential properties of God are attributed unto him, it follows, by a clear and necessary Consequence, that he is Consubstantial with the Father, or that he hath with him one and the same Substance *Numericè*.

You may further urge, if the Son be Consubstantial with the Father, it follows, that he is really and pro-

properly true God; but he cannot be properly and really true God, *ergo*, he is not Consubstantial with his Father.

The *Minor* is proved out of the holy Scriptures. *There is none other God but one.* The Lord of Israel is that true God, for *there is none else besides him.* The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is that only true God; *This is Life eternal, that they might know thee,* O Father, the only true God. For though there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth, as there be Lords many, and Gods many, but to us there is but one God the Father, of

I Cor. 8. 4.
Deu. 4. 35.
Joh. 17. 3.
I Cor. 8. 16.

of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.

1 Tim. 2 5.

For, There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus.

But if according to what St. Paul saith, though there be many that are called Gods and Lords, nevertheless, there is but one true God, and one true Lord; and if according to what Jesus Christ saith, his Father be that only true God, it follows, that Christ or the Son of God is not really and properly true God, and consequently, that he is not Consubstantial with his Father.

Pro-

Probatnr 2°. If Jesus Christ were really and properly true God, his Resurrection should be ascribed unto him, as the true and principal Author; but it is not ascribed to him as the true and principal Author, but to his Father, as we read in several places of the holy Scriptures; *God the Father, who raised him from the dead. God having raised up his Son Jesus, &c.* Gal. 1. 1. Act. 3. 26. Therefore he is not really and properly true God.

Probatnr, 3°. If the Son were really and properly true God, he should have the knowledg of all things; but he hath not the knowledg of all things, since he doth

doth not know the day of Judgment; therefore, &c.

Mat. 24.
36.

The *Minor* is proved thus; *But of that day and hour, saith Christ, knows no man, no not the Angels of Heaven, but my Father only.* Mark that that word (*only*) is exclusive; for if the Father only knows the day and hour of Judgment, it follows, that the Son doth not know it, therefore having not the knowledg of all things, he is not really and properly true God, since to the true God nothing can be unknown.

Probatur, 4^o. Either the Son is of himself, or by another; he is not of himself,

self, because he hath a Father; therefore he is by another; if by another, he cannot be really and properly true God; for he that is by an other is not independent, but the true God is independent.

Probatur, 5°. Christ or the Son is Mediator between God and men; but if the Son was really and properly true God, and Consubstantial with his Father, he should be Mediator between men and himself, which is absurd, because no body is Mediator between himself and another.

D

Pro-

Probatur, 6^o. The Son is begotten, even according to divine Nature : But that which is begotten was not always ; that which was not always, is not eternal ; that which is not eternal, is not really and properly true God, therefore the Son is not really and properly true God and consequently, he is not Consubstantial with his Father.

Joh. 17.
13.

To the first Objection which contains these words of *John, This is Life eternal, &c.* I answer, that by the only true God, is meant God *à se* ; and in that sense the Father is the only true God, because he only is God

à se ; he only is the Ori-
 gine of the Godhead : But
 the Son is God of God, and
 the Image of the invisible
 Father. And to the words
 of St. Paul, *Though there* I Cor. 8. 6.
be that are called Gods, &c.
 I say, that as nothing can
 hinder the Father to be
 Lord, though it be said,
There is but one Lord Jesus
Christ ; so nothing can hin-
 der Jesus Christ to be true
 God, though it be written,
There is but one God the Fa-
ther.

To the Second, I an-
 swer, that as a *non esse ad*
non posse, the Consequence
 is not good, so because the
 Son did not raise up him-
 self from the dead, it doth

not follow, that he could not; and the contrary appears by his own words, I
 Joh. 10. 17 *lay down my Life, that I might take it again, no man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of my self, I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.*

To the Third, I say, that the Son of God according to his humane Nature, knew not the day and hour of Judgment, as he knew not *Lazarus's* Sepulchre, when he asked his Sisters, where they had laid him. And as he knew not what the two Disciples were talking of by the way, when he said
 unto

unto them, *What manner* Luk. 24.
of Communications are these ^{17.}
that ye have one to another,
as ye walk, and are sad?
 And as he knew not whe-
 ther Peter loved him more
 than the rest of his Disci- Joh. 21. 17
 ples, when he said unto him
 the third time, *Lovest thou*
me. But as he was God he
 knew all things, for *In him*
are hid all the treasures of Col. 2. 3.
wisdom and knowledge;
 and as saith *Isaiab,* *The spi-* Isa. 11.
rit of the Lord shall rest up-
on him, the spirit of wisdom
and understanding, the spi-
rit of counsel and might, the
spirit of knowledge, and of
the fear of the Lord. And
 as it appears by these words
 of Peter, *Lord thou knowest* Joh. 21. 17
all things. D 3 Se-

Secondly, I say, because Christ emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a Servant, therefore for a little time he laid down his knowledge, that he might be less than the Angels, and that in all things he might be like unto us, sin only excepted; and that he were born like other Children, who got their knowledge by degrees, as it is written

Luk. 2. 52. in *Luke*, *Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and men.*

Aug. lib. 1. de Trin. Or according to *Austin*, he is said ignorant of the day of Judgment, because he doth not make them know it, that is, he knew it not so, that he would manifest it

it

it to his Disciples. But he was to declare it in a convenient time; of which time to come, speaking as if it were past, he said, *Henceforth I call you not Servants, for the Servant knoweth not what his Lord doth; but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father, I have made them known unto you.* Which things he had not yet declared, but because he was to manifest them certainly, he spake as if he had done it already; for he tells them, *I have yet many things to say* Joh. 16. 12 *unto you, but ye cannot bear them now, amongst which is understood the day of*

ment ; and therefore he hid it from them, and according to that kind of expression, a man is said to be ignorant of that which he keeps from another.

To the Fourth, I say, though the Son be of the Father, and as the Council of *Nice* saith, he be God of God ; nevertheless he is not dependent, because he is begotten from the Father necessarily.

To the Fifth, I answer, that Christ who is the Son of God, and God of God, according to the Council of *Nice*, is Mediator between God the Father and men ; and so he being a Person really distinct from
the

the Father, we cannot say that he is Mediator between men and himself.

To the Sixth, I say, it is true that which was *in tempore*, was not always; but the Son is begotten *ab æterno*, because he is begotten necessarily, and therefore he was always.

Therefore I say, that though by the aforementioned Texts of the holy Scriptures, and Arguments deduced from them, it seems that the Father only is really and properly true God; yet since we read in the holy Writings, that the Son is called *God, the true God, the eternal Life, God blessed over all, the Almigh-*

ty, equal to the Father, and that all the essential Attributes of the Godhead are ascribed unto him, we infer, that he is really and properly true God, and consequently, Consubstantial with his Father.

You may further urge against this, that the Son may be called *God, true God, Almighty, the Eternal Life, the Creator*, and have all the other essential properties of the Godhead, and yet not be really and properly true God, because all these divine Attributes are ascribed unto him dependently, and as a second and instrumental Cause, as it appears by several

veral

veral Texts of the holy Scripture, as for Example, *By whom he spoke unto us in these last days, by whom also he made the Worlds, Heb. 1.2. And he was a man approved by God by Miracles, Wonders, and Signs, which God did by him, Act. 2. 22. God created all things by Jesus Christ, Eph. 3. 9.* And as it is related by several Fathers, *Deus cum mundi creationem meditaretur, verbum suum protulit, quo administro in rerum molitione uteretur.*

But the essential Attributes of the Godhead, are in God independently, and as in the first Cause; therefore, since they are found
in

in the Son dependently, and as in an instrumental Cause, it follows, that he is not really and properly true God, and consequently, that he is not Consubstantial with his Father.

I answer, That though this instance appear to be good and convincing, yet it is of no value, since the Council of *Nice*, which is read upon every Sabbath, and written by so many learned and godly Persons, hath declared in that very time, when such Questions had almost infected all the World, that the Son was *God of God, very God of very God, being of one substance with the Father, and that*

that by him all things were made.

You may urge again; if because the Council of *Nice* hath declared, that the Son is *God of God, very God of very God, and of one substance with the Father*, it is a powerful motive to be convinced of it, why do ye not believe in the Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, Transubstantiation, &c. seeing the Council of *Trent*, which was also composed of several learned and pious Persons, did declare it so ?

I answer, That though we should suppose that the Council of *Trent* was composed of several learned
and

and godly Persons, which is in Question, since some amongst them have declared, that it was a Popes Cabal, it doth not follow, that we are bound to believe in the Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, and Transubstantiation, &c. because it is ordained so by that Council; for they command points of Faith, which can neither be found distinctly in, nor deduced from the holy Scriptures by clear and necessary Consequences, as I have made it appear in a little Treatise, intituled the Church of Rome evidently proved Heretick.

But

But it is not so in the Council of *Nice*, because they would have us to believe an Article of Faith, which, though it be not in the holy Scripture in distinct and express words, yet it is deduced from it by evident and necessary Consequences, as ye have already seen, and shall be made more evident in the following Arguments.

But for the better understanding of it, we must suppose one thing which is true, *viz.* That Jesus Christ or the Son of God, had a real Being before he was born of the blessed Virgin *Mary*, as it appears by his own words, when speaking

ing

ing to his Disciples, he
 Joh. 6. 62. saith, *What and if you shall
 see the Son of man ascending
 up where he was before. The
 bread of God is he which
 cometh down from Heaven;
 I came down from Heaven,
 not to do mine own will, but
 Joh. 16. 27 the will of him that sent me.
 I came forth from the Fa-
 ther, and am come into the
 World, again I leave the
 World, and go to the Fa-
 ther.*

The real existence of the
 Son of God, before he was
 born of the blessed Virgin
 Mary, is again proved
 clearly by this Argument.
 Whosoever was before
 John the Baptist, and be-
 fore Abraham, was some
 space

space of time before Christ was man, or begotten of the Virgin *Mary*. But Jesus Christ, or the Son of God was really existent before *John* the Baptist, and before *Abraham*, as it appeareth by these Testimonies of the Scripture, *This is he of whom I speak, he that cometh after me, is preferred before me, for he was before me. Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am.* And by *Joh. 1. 5.* these words of *St. Paul*, *By whom also he made the Worlds.* *Joh. 8. 59.* This being supposed and true, I argue thus. *Heb. 1. 11, 12. 13.*

The

The Being which Christ had before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary, was not any created, but the divine Essence by which he was always truly and properly God: For he who was subsisting in the form of God, and thought himself to be equal with God (in which thought he could not be deceived nor injurious to God) must of necessity be truly and essentially God, because there can be no equality between the divine Essence which is infinite, and any other whatsoever, which is finite; but so was Christ, as we may see by these words, *Being in the*
form

form of God, he thought it phil.2.6,7.
not robbery to be equal with
God, but emptied himself,
and took upon him the form
of a Servant, and was made
in the likeness of man. Out
 of which words naturally
 result three Propositions,
 fully demonstrating my As-
 sertion, First, That Christ
 was in the form of a Ser-
 vant as soon as he was made
 man ; Secondly, That he
 was in the form of God,
 before he was in the form
 of a Servant ; Thirdly,
 That he was in the form
 of God, that is, did as tru-
 ly and really subsist in the
 divine Nature, as he was
 in the form of a Servant,
 or in the nature of a man :

For

For he was so in the form of God, as thereby to be equal with God : But no other form, beside the essential, which is the divine Nature it self, could infer an equality with God. There can be but one Infinite, Eternal, and Independent Being, and there can be no Comparison between that Infinite, Eternal, and Independent Being, and what is Finite, Temporal, and Dependent. He therefore who did truly think himself equal with God, as being in the form of God, must be conceived to subsist in that one infinite, eternal, and independent Nature of God : And there-

therefore as here Christ was really and essentially man, of the same Nature with us, in whose similitude he was made, so certainly was he also really and essentially God, of the same Nature and Being with him, in whose form he did subsist.

This truth is confirmed by these words of the 1st. of John, *We know that the Son of man is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ, this is the true God, and Eternal Life.* And by these of St. Paul to the Romans,
 Out

Rom. 9. 5. *Out of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.*

From whence we may infer, that he who was truly subsisting in the form of God, and equal with him, before he was in the Nature of man, and who is called God, and the true God, the Almighty, and that in all those ways, by which the supreme Deity is expressed, hath an eternal and indivisible Essence and Nature with God. But Christ was so, and is so called, therefore, &c.

Moreover, is it not written in your Law, saith Christ, *Ye are Gods?* Are not these the very words of
of

of the eighty second Psalm?
 If God himself so spake, or
 the Psalmist from him; if
 this be the Language of
 the Scripture; if Kings and
 Magistrates, and they be
 called Gods, unto whom
 the Word of God came,
 may we not say with greater
 Reason of him whom
 the Father hath sanctified, Col. 2. 9.
 and sent into the World,
 and in whom dwelleth all
 the fulness of the Godhead
 bodily, that he is God?

We grant, That the Father
 is the true God; we
 grant that God only is to
 be worshipped and served,
*Thou shalt worship the Lord
 thy God, and him only shalt
 thou serve.* Therefore we
 must

Paul.

Joh. 5. 22,
23.

must grant that the Son also is the true God, since we are commanded to worship him, and the same honour is given to him, as to the Father, which is seen by these words, *Let all the Angels of God worship him,* and by these of John, *Who hath committed all Judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.* If then we be obliged to worship the God of Israel only, if we be also commanded to give the same worship to the Son, which we give to the Father, or to the God of Israel, it is necessary, that we should believe that the Son

Son is the God of Israel,
and consequently truly and
properly God.

Which is seen clearly by
these words of *Austin*, up-
on those of *St. John*, *All* Joh. i. 9.
things were made by him,
and without him was not
any thing made that was
made : Neque enim dicit
omnia, nisi quæ facta sunt,
id est, omnem Creaturam.
Unde liquido patet ipsum
factum non esse per quem fa-
cta sunt omnia, & si factus
non est, Creatura non est ;
si autem Creatura non est,
eiusdem cum Patre substan-
tia est. Omnis enim sub-
stantia quæ Deus non est,
Creatura est, & quæ Cre-
atura non est, Deus est. Et
E si

*si non est Filius ejusdem
 substantiæ cujus est Pater,
 ergo facta substantia est, si
 facta substantia est, non om-
 nia per ipsum facta sunt, at
 omnia per ipsum facta sunt,
 unius igitur ejusdemq; cum
 Patre substantiæ est, & ideo
 non tantum Deus, sed &
 verus Deus. That is, For
 he doth not say all things,
 but the things which are
 made, to wit, all Creatures.
 From whence it appears
 clearly, that he, by whom all
 things were made, was not
 made. And if he was not
 made, he is not a Creature;
 if he be not a Creature, he is
 of the same substance with
 the Father, for every sub-
 stance which is not God, is*

a Creature ; -and that which is not a Creature, is God. And if the Son be not of the same Substance with the Father, then he is a Substance made ; if a Substance made, all things were not made by him, but all things were made by him, therefore he is of the same Substance with the Father, and consequently, he is not only God, but true God. Joh. 1. 3.

Which is confirmed by these words, wherein he is said to exist before all things ; for if he was not true God, he should be a Creature ; if a Creature, we could not say that he is before all things, because he who should have created him,

E 2 should

should have his Existence before him; for every Creature supposes a Being antecedent from whom it hath received its Existence. Since therefore he is said to be before all things, it is, because he is the true God; for none but the true God can be said properly to be before all things; every Creature having its Being of him, and he neither hath, nor can have his Existence from any thing whatsoever, having it of himself from all Eternity.

Object. The Church of England believes as an Article of Faith, that the Holy Ghost

Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son; and though they can make it appear, that he proceeds from the Father, from the words of St. *John* 15. 26. yet they cannot prove that he proceeds from the Son.

I answer as before, to wit, that these words (*the Holy Ghost* proceeds from the Father and the Son) are not found distinctly in the holy Scripture; but yet are inferr'd from it by clear and necessary Consequences. So these words of Jesus Christ, *All things* Joh. 16. 15 *that the Father hath, are mine*; and those of the 17.

v. 17. 10. Chapter, *All mine are thine, and thine are mine*, prove this evidently ; for if it be true, as it is granted by all Divines, *viz.* That all things that the Father hath, the Son hath likewise, the Relation of Paternity only excepted, the Father producing the Holy Ghost, it follows, that the Son doth produce him also, and consequently, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son, as he proceeds from the Father.

This is manifested by Joh. 16.7. these words of St. John, *It is expedient for you, that I go away, for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart,*

part, I will send him unto you. And by that of the
 15. *When the Comforter is* 15. 26.
come, whom I will send un-
to you from the Father. For

if ye suppose, what ye do
 already believe, and as I
 will make appear in the se-
 quel of my Discourse, viz.
 That the Holy Ghost is
 God, as it is declared by
 the words of the 5th. of the
Acts, To lie to the Holy
Ghost, is to lie unto God;
 and as it appears by the es-
 sential Attributes of the
 Godhead, ascribed unto
 him, as the Sanctification
 of Souls, and Omniscience,
For the Spirit searches all
things, yea the deep things
of God. It follows, be-

1 Cor. 2. 10

cause he cannot be sent as Servants are by their Masters, or Ambassadors by their Lords, since in that mission there is always some dependency ; there is a Superior and inferior ; there is one *Major* and one *Minor*, which can never be found in God ; it follows, I say, by a necessary Consequence, he being sent from the Father and the Son, it is because he proceeds from both.

You may further urge, the Holy Ghost is not truly and properly God ; therefore he doth not proceed from the Father and the Son, according to the manner, as it is believed

ved in the Church of *England*.

The Antecedent appears by these words of St. *John*,
When the spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth, for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and will shew you things to come. From whence I thus argue. Joh. 16. 13

First, He that doth not speak of himself, supposes another distinct Person, from whom he hath received Instruction; but the Holy Ghost doth not speak of himself, therefore he supposes another distinct Person, from whom he hath received Instruction; there-

fore he is not truly and properly God, because he that is truly and properly God, cannot suppose any other Person, from whom he should receive Instruction.

Secondly, He that speaks what he heareth, supposes another Person speaking distinct from him that heareth ; but the Holy Ghost speaketh what he heareth ; therefore he supposes another Person speaking distinct from him ; therefore he is not truly and properly God, because he that is truly and properly God, cannot suppose any other Person speaking unto him, from whom he could

could receive Instruction; this being contrary to the Nature of the true God. The *Major* Proposition of these two Arguments is clear and certain, the *Minor* is from St. *John*, there-
 Joh. 16. 13
 fore it follows, that the Holy Ghost is not truly and properly God, and consequently, that he doth not proceed from the Father and the Son, as the Church of *England* believes.

Answ. I grant that the Holy Ghost doth not speak of himself, but speaks what he heareth, he being not of himself, but of the Father and the Son ; however
 it

it doth not follow, but that he is truly and properly God.

But before I make it appear, it is necessary to observe, that the Holy Ghost is sometimes taken for God himself, sometimes for a divine Quality, sometimes for a Person really distinct from the Father and the Son.

First, He is taken for God himself, *God is a spirit*, *John 4. 24.* For God being Holy and a Spirit, it is evident that he is holy Spirit, and Reciprocally, he that is called holy Spirit *per Excellentiam*, and without dependency, is God. For these Terms, *God*, and
holy

holy Spirit, are really one and the same thing; as likewise these following, *Eternal, Lord, Creator, Conservator*. They differ only in reference to the different effects, which we apply them to. God is named *Eternal*, because he is without Beginning and Ending : Is called *Lord*, because of his Power over all things; *Creator*, because he made them of nothing; and *Conservator*, because he keeps them from returning into nothing : And he is called *Holy Ghost*, *per Excellentiam*; because, to speak properly, none but he is truly Holy, and because he receives his Holiness

ness from no body; all other Creatures whatsoever have their holiness by Communication and Dependency. In that sence the Höly Ghost is not really distinguish'd from the Eternal Father, but only *per Intellectum*, or in as much as the Definition which is ascribed to the Eternal Father, is different from that of the Holy Ghost, as the Eternal is distinguish'd from the Creator. For although it be really one and the same thing, yet our Understandings conceive the Eternal otherwise than the Creator, in as much as the Eternal is a Being without beginning
and

and ending; and the Creator is a first and Independent Cause, who produced all things out of nothing.

Therefore in that sence, the Holy Ghost being not really distinguish'd from the Eternal Father, we cannot say that he proceeds from him, because it would follow, that one and the same thing should be supposed at the same time existing and not existing; existing, because we conceive it to be so; and not existing, because in that instance of Reason, when we should conceive it proceeding from the Father, it should not be existing, which

which is contrary to Reason, since there is no instance of Reason, wherein we can conceive the true God not to be. Therefore it follows, that the Holy Ghost in the aforementioned sence doth not proceed from the Father.

Secondly, He is taken for a *divine Quality*, as when the Holy Ghost said unto those of *Antioch*, *Se-*
 A&.13. 2. *parate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them.* We must conceive it was God, who spake these words, but because God did all this, by that Power within him, which is his Spirit, therefore these words and actions

actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost; in that sense likewise the Holy Ghost is not really distinguish'd from the Eternal Father, and consequently, is not proceeding from him.

Thirdly, He is taken for a Person really distinct from the Eternal Father; and that he is so, is evidently proved by these Texts, *Grieve not the holy spirit of* Eph. 4. 30. *God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption;* and by this to the Romans, *The spirit it self maketh intercession for us, with groanings which cannot be uttered;* and by that of the first to the Corinthians, *The* 1 Cor. 2. 10 *spirit*

*spirit searcheth all things,
yea the deep things of God.*
For Grief is certainly a
personal Affection, of
which a quality is not capa-
ble. We can understand
what is an interceding Per-
son, but we have no ap-
prehension of interceding
and groaning Qualities;
and we understand also,
that to search is a property
belonging to a Person, and
not to a Quality.

You will urge, that it is
ordinary in the holy Scrip-
ture to find the like Ex-
pressions, which are proper
unto Persons, given unto
those things which are no
Persons; as when the Apo-
stle saith, *Charity suffereth*
long,

long, and is kind; charity 1 Cor. 13.
envieth not, vaunteth not it 4, 5.

self, &c. All which personal Actions are attributed to Charity, which is no Person, but belonging to that Person which is charitable; because that Person, which is so qualified, doth perform those Actions according to, and by the vertue of that Charity, which is in him. In the same manner, personal Actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost, which is no Person, but only the Virtue, Power and Efficacy of God the Father, who is a Person, and doth perform those personal Actions attributed to the Holy Ghost,
 by

by the Virtue, Power and Efficacy in himself, which is the Holy Ghost.

Ans. This giveth no satisfaction; for there are several personal Attributes given in the holy Scriptures expressly to the Holy Ghost, which cannot be ascribed to God the Father; as for Example, to make Intercession, is a personal Action, and this Action is attributed to the Spirit of God, as it appears by these Rom. 8. 27. words of St. Paul, *Because he maketh intercession for the Saints, according to the Will of God.* But to make Intercession is an Act, which cannot be attributed to God

God the Father, for it would follow, that the Father should make Intercession to himself, which is absurd, because he that maketh Intercession, is supposed to be distinct from him, to whom he maketh Intercession.

Moreover, To come unto men as being sent unto them, is a personal Action; but the Comforter, or the Holy Ghost did come, being sent, as it is seen by these words of St. John, *When the Comforter is come, whom I will send you from the Father ; and if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart, I will send him unto* Joh. 15.26 Joh. 16.7.

unto you; ergo, the Holy Ghost cannot be ascribed in this place to God the Father, since God the Father sendeth, but is never sent.

And to speak and hear are personal Actions, and both together attributed to the Holy Ghost, in such a manner as they cannot be attributed to God the Father; as it appears by those words of *John*, *When the spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth, for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that he shall speak.* Now to speak, and not of himself, cannot be attributed to God the Father,

Joh. 16. 13

ther, since he doth all things of himself. And to speak what he heareth, cannot be also attributed to God the Father, who can receive no Instruction from another. Seeing then the Holy Ghost speaketh, and not of himself, and speaketh what he heareth, it followeth evidently that he is not God the Father, neither a divine Quality, which cannot be said properly to speak and hear, but that he is a Person distinct from the Father.

Now that the Holy Ghost as a Person really distinct from the Father, is truly and properly God, appears by these words of
St.

St. Peter, for when Peter
 said, *Ananias, Why hath
 Satan filled thy heart to lie
 to the Holy Ghost?* He re-
 peateth the same Question,
 in reference to the same
 Offence, *Why hast thou con-
 ceived this thing in thine
 heart? Thou hast not lied
 unto men, but unto God.*
 He means there the true
 God, as it appears by these
 words, *Thou hast not lied
 unto men, but unto God.* For,
 when he saith, *Thou hast
 not lied unto men, but unto
 God,* it is as if he should
 say, thou hast not lied un-
 to Creatures, since men are
 Creatures, but thou hast
 lied unto him who is no
 Creature, and consequent-
 ly

Act. 5. 4.

ly unto him who is true God. And if the Holy Ghost could be taken sometimes for a Creature, this Proposition of St. *Peter*, *To lie to the Holy Ghost, is to lie unto God*, would not always be true; therefore St. *Peter* speaking without distinction, and without a limited sence, 'tis to prove that this word, *Holy Ghost*, is never taken in the holy Scripture, but for the true God.

Moreover, to whom the divine Attributes do belong, as certainly as they belong unto God the Father, he is truly and properly God, because these are divine Attributes, which

F are

are properties of the Divine Nature, and none can be indued with, to whom the Nature of God doth not belong: But the divine Attributes, as Omniscience, the Sanctification of Souls, and the like, do belong as certainly unto the Holy Ghost, as they do unto God the Father; therefore it followeth, that the Holy Ghost is truly and properly God, and consequently that he proceedeth from the Father and the Son, as it is declared in the Symbol of *Nice*.

Obj. The Church of *England* doth neither believe, nor practice all that is

is contained in these words,
viz. Abstain from meats of- Act. 15. 29
fered to Idols, and from
blood, and from things
strangled, and from forni-
cation; therefore she is
 not the holy Catholick
 Church, since the holy Ca-
 tholick Church is that, that
 believes and practises the
 whole Christian Doctrine,
 as I have made it appear
 already.

Ans. This Command-
 ment was in the time of
 the Primitive Church, but
 was abolished by the Apo-
 stles. Because the Jews
 would not eat things stran-
 gled, nor Blood, the Apo-
 stles enjoined, that the

Gentiles embracing the Christian Religion, ought in Charity to Conform herein to the *Jews*, and not give Offence where the thing was it self indifferent. Wherefore St. Paul
 1 Cor. 8. 13 *saith, If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh, while the World standeth, lest I make my brother to offend. But now the Commandment is past, and abolish'd by the Apostles, and therefore it is not true that the Church of England doth believe and practise any thing contrary to the holy Scripture.*

For the better understanding of this Truth, we must know, that in the
 wor

words enjoyned to the Gentiles embracing the Christian Religion, to wit, *Abstain from pollution of Idols, and from Fornication, and from things strangled and from blood,* there is something bad in it self, and something bad by Accident ; something bad for ever, and something bad for a time only, something belonging to the Moral Law, and something belonging to the Ceremonial. The thing bad in it self for ever, and belonging to the Moral Law, is to abstain from Idolatry, and from Fornication ; and the thing bad by accident, for a time only, and belonging to the

Exod. 20.

Ceremonial Law, is to abstain from things strangled and from Blood. Now it is certain, that to abstain from Idolatry, and Fornication, is a part of the Moral Law, seeing it is written, *Thou shalt have no other Gods, but me; and thou shalt not commit Adultery.* It is also true, that these things are bad in themselves, and for ever, because they were forbidden in time past, are now unlawful, and shall be for time to come; which appears by these words of St. Paul, to the Corinthians *Neither Fornicators, nor Adulterers shall inherit the Kingdom of God.*

Cor. 6. 9.

'Tis likewise certain, that
 to *Abstain from things*
Strangled and from Blood,
 belongs to the Ceremonial
 Law; it is also without
 doubt, that it was abolish-
 ed, as it is seen in these
 words of St. Paul, *Whatso-*
ever is sold in the Shambles, 1 Cor. 10.
25.
that eat, asking no question
for Conscience sake, for the
Earth is the Lords, and the
fulness thereof; if any of
them that believe not bid you
to a Feast, and ye be disposed
to go, whatsoever is set be-
fore you, eat, asking no que-
stion for Conscience sake.
 And by these to Timothy,
 where it is said, that *Eve-*
ry Creature of God is good, 1 Tim. 4.
and nothing to be refused, if
 F 4 it

it be received with thanksgiving; and forbidding to abstain from meats, is a doctrine of Devils. And by these to the Romans,

Rom. 14.
14.

I know and am perswaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of it self, but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean.

And that ye may not say, that these words of St. Paul were written before those of the Council held at Hierusalem, or of the 15th. of the *Acts*, the contrary is to be seen in the eighth Chapter, wherein it appears, that after these things Paul came to *Corinth*, and continued there

Act. 15. 29

a year and six months, teaching the Word of God amongst the People of that City, to whom he did write two Epistles some years after. From whence it is evident, that this Commandment to abstain from Meats and things strangled and from Blood, is now abolished.

I must confess, that if any Person would keep himself wholsom, and have a mild and benign Temper, he ought to abstain from both; for seeing that Axiome is received amongst Physitians, *ex his constamus ex quibus nutrimur*; and since experience teacheth, that those who feed

upon Blood, are commonly cruel and bloody ; and those that feed upon Meats strangled are neither so healthful, nor live so long as those that abstain from them, it ought to be sufficient to perswade us to abstain from both. However in eating Blood and Meats strangled, there is no sin. And to make it appear, we must know the Ceremonial Law changeth as the shadow of our Body, when the Sun shines upon it differently ; and so may be considered in three different times. First, when God did establish it by *Moses* unto the death of our Lord Jesus Christ,

Who

Who blotted out the hand- Col. 2.
*writing of Ordinances, that
 was against us, and took it
 out of the way, nailing it to
 his Cross, as it is written
 in the 2d. to the Colossi-
 ans. Secondly, From the
 death of our Lord Jesus
 Christ, unto the destructi-
 on of the Synagogue, and
 perfect manifestation of
 the Gospel. Thirdly, From
 the manifestation of the
 Gospel, unto the end of
 the World. In the first time
 that Commandment, To
 abstain from things stran-
 gled and from Blood, ought
 to be kept, and the Trans-
 gressors were cast out of
 the Synagogue, and sepa-
 rated from the People of
 Isra-*

Israel. In the Second they were bound to keep it, for Conscience sake, and that they might not offend the *Jews*. But in the Third, after the Gospel was manifested, that Commandment was abolished, as I have made it appear already ; and therefore when the Church of *England* eat things strangled and Blood, it is not true, that they believe and practise any thing now forbidden in the holy Scripture.

Object. The Church of *England* believes, and puts it in practise, that we ought to baptize young Children, before they can use their
OWN

own Reason, and give account of their Faith; but that Doctrine is not agreeable to the holy Scripture, there being mention made only of the Baptism of adult Persons, I mean of them that can be instructed, and are able of Faith and Repentance, as it appears by these Texts, *Teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the Name of Jesus Christ, for remission of sins; if ye believe, ye may be baptized.* Therefore the Church of England is not the holy Catholick Church, since she be-

Mat. 28. 19

A& 2. 38.

(NO)

believeth, and practiseth
an Article of Faith, which
is not agreeable to the holy
Scripture.

Ans. First, I grant, that
the Baptism of young Chil-
dren is not *Necessary neces-*
sitate medii, as the Church
of *Rome* believes, teaching
that they cannot possibly
be saved, unless they receive
the Water of Baptism ;
because the Grace of God
doth not always depend
upon Elements, which are
not in our power at every
time. And the Baptism
that saves us, saith St. Pe-
ter, *Is not that that puts a-*
way the filth of the Flesh,
but the Answer of a good Con-
science

1 Pet. 3. 21

science towards God, by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Therefore that which shuts the Gates of the Kingdom of Heaven against us, is not a meer and innocent privation of Baptism, but the Contempt and Prophana- tion of it, and a bad Con- science, which will not for- sake sin.

Secondly, I say, That the Baptism of young Chil- dren is necessary, *necessitate præcepti*, that is to say, as much as it is possible to obey the Commandment of Jesus Christ; and though this Precept be not found in the holy Scripture, in distinct and express words, yet it may be inferred from
thence

thence by clear and necessary Consequences.

My first Proof concerning the Baptism of young Children, is from the Covenant of Grace, wherein God makes appear the eternal Riches of his Mercies and Compassions in so great a measure, that he receives no body in that holy Covenant, without receiving their Children likewise ; as it is seen in these words, which God spake to *Abraham*, saying,

Gen. 17. 7. *I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy Seed after thee in their Generations, for an everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy Seed after*

after thee. And by those of the *Acts*, wherein St. Peter speaks thus unto the Jews ; *Be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, for the promise is unto you, and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.* From which words I infer these two Arguments.

First, All that are partakers of the Covenant of Grace, ought to be Partakers of the Seal of that Covenant, and of that Sacrament, which is the Mystical sign of our entring into that Covenant ; now not only the Faithful are Partakers

takers of the Covenant of Grace, but their Children also, as appears by the a-forementioned Texts, both of *Genesis* and *Acts*; therefore not only the Faithful, but their Children also ought to be partakers of the Seal of that Covenant, and consequently of Baptism, which is the Mystical Sign of our entring into that Covenant.

Secondly, Unto whom the Promise is made, they ought to be baptized, as it appears by the words of St. Peter, *Act. 2. 39.* But the Promise is made unto the Children, as well as unto their Parents; therefore Children ought to be baptized. Which

Which is confirmed by these words of St. Matthew, *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; now young Children are of the number of Nations; therefore unto them belongs Baptism; therefore they ought to be baptized. Mat. 29. 18

You may further urge, Immediately before that Text in the *Acts*, *Be baptized every one of you, &c.* it is read, *Repent.* And in that of St. Matthew, we read, *Teach all Nations*; and so Repentance and Doctrine are presupposed before Baptism; but young Children, who cannot use
their

their Reason, neither are capable of one, or the other; therefore it follows, they ought not to be baptized.

Ans^r. We ought to teach them that are able to be taught, and baptize them that are able to be baptized. Repentance and Doctrine are necessary in adult Persons, but not in young Children. Otherwise it should follow, that the new Law, which is a Law of Grace, should be less favourable, than the old, which is a Law of Rigor; and that Jesus Christ were come to lessen the favours of God, and not to increase them;

them ; seeing in the old
 Law, young Children were
 circumcised ; now since
 Baptism is in the place of
 Circumcision, we are to bap-
 tize young Children, since
 they were circumcised ;
 and seeing Circumcision,
 which was a Ceremony, and
 divine Institution, did nei-
 ther require Doctrine, nor
 Repentance in young Chil-
 dren, though it were ne-
 cessary in adult Persons, as
 it appears in *Abraham*, and
 in all others who turned
Jews ; even so Baptism,
 which is a Ceremony, and
 a divine Institution, doth
 neither require Faith, nor
 Repentance in young Chil-
 dren, although it doth in a-
 dult Persons. Which

Mat. 19. 13

Which is confirmed by the words of St. Matthew, where it is said, that They brought unto Jesus Christ little Children, that he should put his hands on them, and pray, and that the Disciples rebuking them, Jesus said, suffer little Children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the Kingdom of God. From whence I argue thus.

To whom do belong the things signified, unto them belong the Signs also; as the Crown, which is the Sign and Mark of Royalty, belongs to him, to whom the Kingdom belongs; but unto little Children belongs the Kingdom of God, as it

is written in St. Matthew,
19. 13. Therefore unto
them belongs Baptism,
which is the Sign of the en-
tering into that Kingdom.

For except a man be born of Joh. 3. 5.

water and of the Spirit, he
cannot enter into the King-
dom of God. Therefore

young Children born with
original sin, (as it appears
in several places of the ho-
ly Scripture, but especially
by these words of St. Paul
to the Romans, By the Of-

fence of one, Judgment came
upon all men to Condemna-
tion,) are not to be depri-

Rom. 5.]

ved of Baptism, lest they
should not enter into the
Kingdom of Heaven; which
is the Reason that St. Cy-

prian

prian and *Austin* have so often declared the Baptism of little Children to be necessary.

Moreover, if they brought unto Jesus Christ young Children, and he put his hands on them, and prayed for them; why shall they not bring unto him little Children in the Church? Why shall not the Minister pray for them? And why shall he not confer unto them the Ceremony, or the Institution of Baptism, as Jesus Christ gave unto little Children the Ceremony or Institution of Imposition of hands? I ask this Question, whether the Ceremony of Imposition of hands

hands was in vain, or whether they received by it some particular Grace from Christ? Ye will not say, that it was in vain, because then Jesus Christ in whom were hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledg, would not have used it; if they received by it some special Grace, notwithstanding their want of Repentance and Faith, which they were not then capable of, why shall not young Children now receive the Ceremony of Baptism, and thereby all Graces annexed unto it, though they be not capable of Faith and Repentance? When a Father or

G

Mo-

Mother were baptized, all those of the Household were baptized also, as it appears **Act. 16. 13** in the *Acts*, where it is said, that *Lydia* a seller of Purple of the City of *Thyatira* was baptized, and her Household; and that the Keeper of the Prison was baptized, he and all his. And in the first Chapter of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, **1 Cor. 1. 16** St. Paul saith, that he hath baptized the Household of *Stephanus*; but it is probable, though not convincing, that in so many Families there were Children.

And since our Fathers and their Children were **1 Cor. 10. 2** baptized in the Cloud, and

in the Sea, and they being
 the Figures of our Baptism,
 as is evident by *St. Paul*;
 that that which is by them
 figured, may be accomplish-
 ed, the Children now ought
 to be baptized in the Bap-
 tism of Jesus Christ.

Object. It is forbidden in
 several places of the holy
 scriptures, to Swear, or to
 take an Oath. *Ye have* Mat. 5. 33,
heard that it hath been said 34.
of them of old time, thou
shalt not forswear thy self, but
say unto you, Swear not at
all, neither by Heaven, &c.
But let your Communication
be yea, yea, and nay, nay, for
whatsoever is more than
these, cometh of evil; and in

the Epistle of St. James,
 Jam. 5 12. *Above all things, my Brethren, swear not, lest ye fall into Condemnation.*

But the Church of England is not against swearing or taking an Oath; yea she uses, and maintains it lawful; therefore she believes and practises an Article forbidden in the holy Scripture; therefore she is not the holy Catholick Church.

Before I give an Answer it is necessary to know, that an Oath is an Invocation to God, or an Appeal to him as a Witness of the Truth of what we say; so that in case that that we swear be not true, we, if not expressly, at least virtually invoke

invoke God as a Judge and Avenger.

There are two sorts of Oaths, one Assertory, and the other Promissory ; an assertory Oath is, when we promise by Oath something that is Future ; and if our promise be made directly and immediately to God, 'tis called a Vow ; if to men, an Oath. That being supposed ;

I Answer, That an Oath is not only lawful, but also is sometimes necessary, as when mens Estates are concern'd, and no Evidence can be had to decide and clear the matter, but what is assured by Oath. Then it is necessary to make an

end of, and decide the Controversie ; as it appears by these words of St. Paul,
 Heb. 6. 16. *An Oath for Confirmation, is to them an end of strife.*

And its lawfulness appears by several Texts of the holy Scripture, where in God, who is truth it self, and cannot lie, and consequently might be believed of men upon his bare word, and without necessity of making an Oath, yet to confirm his promises, is willing to take it. For when God made the Promise to *Abraham*, because he could not swear by a greater, he swore by himself. And verse 17. *God willing more abundantly to shew*

shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his Counsel, confirmed it by an Oath. Therefore if God himself swears and takes an Oath, why shall it not be lawful to men to take an Oath in dubious matters, and of great Concern, and when no Evidence can be had to decide and clear them?

Was not *Mephibosheth* spared because of the Lord's Oath, that was between them, between *David* and *Jonathan* the Son of *Saul*? 2 Sam. 21. 7.

Did not the Law of *Moses* in many cases require them?

Doth not *St. Paul* use them oftentimes? as when he

saith, *God is my witness.* I Rom. 1. 9.

call God for a Record upon my Soul. Before God I lie not. Which Oaths, St. Paul, who was to teach the Precepts of Christ to others, should not have used, if they had been unlawful, and forbidden in the holy Scriptures.

And Christ himself, as ye may read, Mat. 26. 63, 64. did not refuse it, when the High-Priest asked him to answer upon his Oath, whether he was the Son of God. I adjure thee, saith the High-Priest, by the living God that thou tell us, whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God, and Jesus said unto him, thou hast said.

There-

Therefore seeing Jesus Christ himself doth answer, when he is adjured upon Oath, & St. *Paul* oftentimes called God to witness, for the Confirmation of what he saith :seeing *David* and several others have used it in the Old Testament, and God himself, who cannot give us a bad Example, used it for the Confirmation of his Promises, it is a clear and evident sign, that it is lawful, and that we are to explain these words of St. *Matthew*, *I say unto you, swear not at all*; as also these others of St. *James*, *above all things, my Brethren, swear not*; they ought to be interpreted not

generally, but in a limited sense, as only forbidding swearing in common Conversation, and in our ordinary Commerce and Affairs, as it appears by the words immediately following, *viz. Let your Communication be yea, yea, and nay, nay, for whatsoever is more than these, cometh of evil.*

From whence it follows, though Swearing or Oaths ought to be avoided in our Conversations, because they are then so many sins, yet there is a time, and there are occasions, as when the matter is doubtful, and of concern, and no Evidence can be had to clear and decide

cide it, when they are not only lawful, but also very necessary. And therefore when at certain times, and upon certain occasions the Church of England commands to swear or take an Oath, and believes it lawful, she doth neither believe, nor practise any thing forbidden in the holy Scripture.

Object. It is written in the 20th. Chapter of Exod. Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day, six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy Son,

Exod. 20.
8, 9, 10.

Son, nor thy Daughter, thy man-Servant, nor thy maid-Servant, nor thy Cattel, nor thy Stranger that is within thy Gates, for in six days the Lord made Heaven, and Earth, the Sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day, wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.

The Church of England doth not keep this divine Commandment, but observes the first day of the week, instead of the seventh; therefore she is not the holy Catholick Church.

Before I give an Answer to this Objection, I will give leave to my Adversary

ry to say all that he can, to establish his Opinion.

When I read, saith he, these words in the 20th. Chapter of *Exodus*, or when I see them written in great Letters in our Churches, or hear them pronounced aloud at the Communion Table, the first day of the week, which we call Sunday, I think that the words of *Isaiab*, *Hear ye indeed, but understand not, and see ye indeed, but perceive not*, may be well here adapted. And may not this be justly attributed unto us, since the *Jews* excepted with a small number of Christians scattered in the *North*; we neither
practise

Isa. 6. 9.
and Mat.
13. 14.

practise what we read, nor
 what we hear. And that
 this may appear clearly, it
 is necessary to consider
 without any prejudice, that
 the aforesaid words con-
 tain a day determined by
 God, which we are bound
 to keep holy, and where-
 on we ought to rest. But
 it is the seventh day which
 God kept holy, and where-
 on he rested, therefore it is
 that and no other, which
 we ought to keep holy, and
 whereon we are bound to
 rest. That it is the day
 upon which God rested,
 which we are bound to
 keep holy, appears evident-
 ly by these words : *In it*
thou shalt not do any work;
 For

For what mean these words, but thou shalt not do any work in the day, whereon God rested? This is the most natural Explication that a man can give to them. But God foreseeing he should be forgot by his Creatures, gives us warning, saying, *Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day.* And that that day is the seventh, which we call Saturday, appears again evidently, First, by these words, *But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.* Secondly, by the next, *In six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth, the Sea and all that in them is, and rested the* se-

seventh day. Thirdly, because we read in *Genesis*,
Gen. 2. 23. *God rested on the seventh day from all his works, which he had made, and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it.* Therefore it is that day which is to be kept holy ; for it is an Axiome received in Divinity, viz. that men neither can, nor ought to change, what was established and determined by God ; as for Example, Water in Baptism, and Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, cannot be changed by men, because they have been established and determined by Jesus Christ, who is received as God among Christians. Is
it

it not written, Cursed is
 he that addeth any thing
 to the Law, or diminisheth
 from it? doth not *St. Paul*
 forbid, not to think of men 1 Cor. 4. 6.
 above that which is writ-
 ten? and doth not *Christ*
 himself say in *St. Matthew*,
 In vain they do worship me
 teaching for Doctrines the
 Commandments of men?
 That the seventh day is our
 Saturday, is again manife-
 sted, First, because since
Moses, the *Jews* who did
 always, and do still keep
 the seventh day, do keep
 our Saturday for their Sab-
 bath. Secondly, Because
 as Sabbath among the
Hebrews is the seventh day,
Sabbato among the *Italians*,
 Sab-

Sabbado among the *Spaniards*; *Samedy* among the *French*, so is Saturday among the *English* men. Thirdly, Because the Evangelists saying in our Translation, that Jesus Christ was risen the first day of the week, which, according to the Language of the Scriptures, is the next day after the Sabbath; it follows evidently, our Saturday preceding the first day of the week, and the Sabbath being the seventh day, that the seventh day is our Sabbath. But it is in vain to bring such Proofs unto them, who acknowledged to have changed the Saturday or seventh, to the

the first day of the week. Therefore since our Saturday is the seventh day of the week, and God rested on it, blessed, sanctified it, and commanded us to keep it holy, is it not just, in Obedience to God, to keep it so?

Some will answer, saith my Adversary, that that change was made, First, That we might have no Communication with the *Jews*; Secondly, Because Jesus Christ arose upon the first day of the week; Thirdly, Because we read, that the Apostles met on that day.

To

To the first Objection
my Adversary replyeth,
that we ought to have Com-
munication with the *Jews*
in all things which are
good : Otherwise the *Jews*
believing in one God, we
should not believe so ; and
they believing in the Old
Testament, it should not
be the Object of our
Faith.

To the Second he saith,
that a Question may be
made, whether he rose on
the first day of the week ;
none of the Evangelists in
the Original saying in ex-
press words, the first day
of the week, but *εἰς μίαν*

Mat. 28. 1.

Luk. 27.

Joh. 2. 1.

Σαββατῶν · τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῇ Σαββατῶν

But though this be true, is it

a sufficient Reason to change the day which God himself hath prescribed unto us, blessed, sanctified and commanded? We may remember the day of his Resurrection, and keep it holy; but we ought not, because he rose upon the first day of the week, to abolish the true Sabbath, to transpose it to another day, without an express Commandment, either of Christ or of his Apostles. And if that Reason were good, might we not say, because he dyed on such a day, we ought also to transfer the Sabbath unto it?

And

And to the third Objection, it is true, saith he, we read in our Translation, that the Apostles met on the first day of the week, but, mark ye, that it was

1 Cor. 16.1 *Concerning the Collection for the Saints*, as ye may read in the 16th. Chapter of the first to the *Corinthians*. And though it were also to *Preach and break Bread*, as

Act. 20. 7. it appears in the *Acts*; yet, saith he, if this Reason were sufficient for the changing of the Sabbath into the first day of the week, this should be sufficient also for the continuing of it in the seventh; since we read that the Apostles met oftentimes together on the Sabbath to pray,

pray, preach, and baptize. Act. 16.
13, 14, 15.
 And Christ himself and his
 Apostles were strict Sab-
 bath-keepers; they even af-
 ter his death. And Christ
 seems to favour this Opi-
 nion, when in the 24th.
 Chapter of St. *Matthem*, Mat. 24. 20
 speaking not only concern-
 ing the Destruction of *Hi-*
erusalem, but also concern-
 ing the last day of Judg-
 ment, he saith, *Pray ye,*
that your flight be not in
the Winter, neither on the
Sabbath day. und in Sabbath
 From which words this Ar-
 gument is deduced: In
 Christ's time the Sabbath
 was on the seventh day,
 therefore when he com-
 manded us to pray, that
 at

at the day of Judgment, our flight should not be on the Sabbath day, he commanded us to pray that it should not come on the seventh day; and since this Commandment of Christ is still the same at that time, in reference to the last day of Judgment, the same day ought to continue still, otherwise his Commandments and Threatnings are vain.

And it signifieth nothing to say, that in the words of the fourth Commandment there is something moral, as the Sanctification of days without any determination, which cannot be abolished; and something

thing Ceremonial, as the determination of a day, which may be changed. For if the determination of the seventh day be meerly Ceremonial, and consequently may be changed, likewise the Determination of the first day of the week is meerly Ceremonial, and therefore may be changed also. Wherefore the Reason why this is kept rather than another, is meer Policy, and to avoid Confusion, which we could not prevent, if there were not a day determined. But if that Reason be valid, is it not better to take the day assigned by God, whereon he rested,

H

which

which he sanctified and blessed above all others? upon which he declares, he will bless them that keep it holy, as he will curse and punish the Transgressors of it; which was kept by Jesus Christ and his Apostles, which God commanded in express words, and which Christ doth now command; for, as I have made it appear, this Ordinance, *Pray ye, that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath,* stands at this very day. Is it not better, I say, to take that day, than that whereof we find no Commandment in the holy Scripture?

Again,

Again, It signifieth nothing to say, it is written in the 2d. Chapter to the

Colossians, Let no man

judge you in meat or in

drink, or in respect of an ho-

ly day, or of the new Moon,

or of the Sabbath days, which

are a shadow of things to

come, but the body is of Christ;

for in this place, the word,

Sabbaths, instead of shew-

ing that the seventh day

could be changed into the

first of the week, serves

only to make it appear, we

ought to have no determi-

ned day. Therefore since

it is certain, and granted

by all men, that though

we are to sanctifie all the

days of our life, that is to

Col. 2. 16,
17.

say, to live holily ; yet we ought particularly, to set aside one day of the week, whereon we ought to rest, and keep holy to God Almighty : These words then of *St. Paul* to the *Colossians*, are not to be understood concerning the Sabbath assigned in the 20th Chapter of *Exodus*, but concerning other Sabbaths which besides this, the *Jews* did keep.

It is then evident, if we lay down all prejudices that the said Objections are not strong enough to contradict what is before asserted, viz. that men neither can, nor ought to change what is established and deter-

terminated by God, as it is the consent of all Divines, and holy Scriptures; and notwithstanding all that I have just now alledged, the Church of *England* changing the seventh, unto the first day of the week, to keep it holy, it is manifest, she breaks the fourth Commandment of the Decalogue, and consequently, is not the holy Catholick Church.

Answ. All the words contained in the fourth Commandment do not bind equally, some containing a Commandment, as *Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day*; and some in-

H 3 cluding

1 Cor. 10.
25.

cluding a Permission, as, *Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work*; as likewise these of St. Paul to the Corinthians, *Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no Question for Conscience sake.* In these sorts of Expressions God doth not command, but gives only permission and leave to eat of whatsoever is sold in the Shambles : As well as to eat of the Fruit of the Trees of the Garden, excepting the Tree of Life, which was forbidden our first Parents. It is then clear, that these words, *Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work*, include but a Permission ; for I think
no

no body will say, that it is not lawful to a man on any other day of the week, to abstain from gross and slavish works, to the end he might meditate God's Works and Perfections, and apply himself unto Exercises of Charity and Piety.

Second Answer, All that are contained in the Decalogue, are not, *ex Jure naturali*, nor belong to the *Moral Law*, and consequently, are not Immutable; for the Preface, *Hear Israel, I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the Land of Ægypt, out of the House of bondage*, sheweth evidently, that God speaks unto Israel according

H 4

cording to the Flesh, as
 they were a Type of *Israel*
 according to the Spirit;
 and puts them in mind of
 his renowned favours to-
 wards them, in delivering
 them out of the bondage
 of *Ægypt*, as a Type of
 our spiritual Redemption,
 and slavery under the De-
 vil, Sin, and Death. Now
 if either we consider the
 Type, or the thing signifi-
 ed thereby, neither of them
 are *ex Jure naturali*, or be-
 long to the Moral Law,
 (which is the same, and
 Immutable at all times, and
 among all Nations) but are
 grounded upon the good
 pleasure of God, who, by
 his special goodness to-
 wards

wards that People, was pleased so to deal with them.

Third Answer, These words of the fourth Commandment, *In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy Son, nor thy Daughter, thy man-Servant, nor thy maid-Servant, nor thy Cattel, nor the Stranger which is within thy Gates*, could not have relation to *Adam* and *Eve*, when they were first created; because in that state they saw no strangers in their Family. These words were especially related to the ancient *Israelites*, who had lived in *Ægypt* like strangers, to the end they might learn,

H 5 when.

when they should possess the Land of Promise, to deal with all the World, otherwise than the *Ægyptians* had dealt with them. And therefore the aforementioned words cannot be understood, *ex Jure naturali*, as belonging to the Moral Law, it being alike and the same among all Nations.

Fourth Answer, The next words, *For in six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth, the Sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day*, do not infer in themselves an indispensable necessity; for no body doubts, but that God could create this great World

World with all its perfe-
ctions in a less time, yea,
in a moment, if he had
pleased; and consequent-
ly, that he could appoint
another day than the se-
venth to be kept holy, as
for Example, the third, if
on that day he had finish-
ed the Creation of the
World. But being finish'd
in six days, the Question
is, whether the seventh be
of an indispensable necessi-
ty. Wherefore,

I Answer, Fifthly, That
the day assigned by God
for his Worship, was Sym-
bolical, Mystical, and Ce-
remonial, and consequent-
ly, ought to be abolished,
and so was not of an indis-
pensable

pensable Necessity, and
 therefore did not belong
 to the Moral Law. That
 the institution of the Sab-
 bath day was such, may
 be seen clearly, because *Adam*
 the first of all men,
 was able by the strength of
 his natural Reason, in the
 state of Innocency, to com-
 prehend what belonged to
 the Natural and Moral
 Law; but by the strength
 of his Reason, he could ne-
 ver understand why the se-
 venth day ought to be kept
 holy, rather than another.
 Therefore the Reason of it
 was the good Will of God,
 which *Adam* could never
 understand of himself,
 wanting a special Revela-
 tion

tion, or positive Commandment, wherein the Reason of it might be manifested unto him.

And it signifies nothing, to say, that it is written, we are bound to keep holy the seventh day *for ever*, because by the word, *for ever*, is meant only a long space of time assigned by God, as it appears in these Texts, *Exod. 21. 6. Exod.*

32. 13. Levit. 24. 8, 9. Numb. 18. 19. Numb. 25.

13. Wherein though the word, *for ever*, be used; yet we say it belongs to the Ceremonial Law, and consequently, ought to be abolished under the Gospel, where the body of these

Col. 2. 17.

these things, whereof they were but a shadow, is made manifest.

And that the Institution of the seventh day, reduplicative *ut sic*, could be abolished, appears by the words of the Prophet Eze-

Ezek. 20. 12. I gave them my Sabbath to be a sign between me and them, that they might know, that I am the Lord that sanctifie them. And by the other words of St.

Col. 2. 16, Paul to the Colossians, Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new Moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ. Now, seeing the

the Plural Number contains all Singulars; Sabbaths being taken in the Plural Number, it followeth, that that contained in the Decalogue, and which is here in Dispute, is also included therein: Otherwise St. Paul would not have failed to make an exception.

The Sabbath, saith Christ, was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath. Now he that is the Lord of any thing, can dispose of it as it seems good unto him, therefore the Son of man being Lord also of the Sabbath, he may dispose of it

Mark 2.
27, 28.

as he pleaseth, and therefore might abolish it; and consequently, it doth not belong to the Natural or Moral Law, which cannot be changed, even by God himself.

And it signifies nothing, to say, that Jesus Christ himself, and his Apostles, have kept and sanctified the seventh day; for they did keep it as they did some other Commandments of the Ceremonial Law, which were all abolished in their convenient time; to the end that they might not offend the Jews, among whom they were born, and to whom especially they were to preach the holy Gospel;

Gospel; but might convert them to Christian Religion, and call them that were predestinated, *and might by all means save some*; and ¹ Cor. 9. so propagate the more the ^{22.} Kingdom of God, *Which doth not consist in meat and drink, or in distinction of sabbaths, but in righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.*

From whence it follows, that the Sanctification of the seventh day, *reduplicative ut sic*, did not belong to the Moral Law, and consequently, might be abolished. I say, the Sanctification of the seventh day, *ut sic*, for in reference of that which is Moral, I mean,

mean, the true Piety and Worship due unto God, it could not be abolished, and no man in the World in whatsoever dignity, yea, nor God himself, can dispense with.

Now the Worship due unto God may be considered in two respects, inwardly, or outwardly. Considered in the first sence, it respects our Confidence in God, our Obedience to his Commandments, our Invocation, Praises, and Thanksgivings. Considered in the latter, it respects places, where are publick Meetings, wherein the Word of God is preached, and his Sacraments are administered.

stred. In reference to the outward Worship due unto God, it is necessary (to avoid Confusion from whence proceed great evils) to establish some Order, and to appoint certain days and hours to meet together, that we might praise and worship our Lord, call upon his holy Name, and give thanks for all his unmeasurable mercies.

Now the Church, to which Christ gave his Authority and Power, and whose Ordinances he will have us to keep, as it appears by these words, *If he neglect to hear the Church, Mat. 18.17 let him be unto thee as an heathen*

heathen man, and a Publican, had good and sufficient Reasons to change the seventh into the first day of the week. First, Because being Typical and Mystical, and not belonging to the Moral Law, as I have made it appear, it might be abolished, as all the other Precepts of the Ceremonial Law were: For

Col. 2. 14. *Christ blotting out the handwriting of Ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his Cross.*

Secondly, The Sanctification of the seventh day being ordained unto us, to the end we might remember

ber the day and benefit of our Creation, as it appears by the words of the 11th. verse, *For in six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth, &c.* The Church which we ought to obey in all things, not contrary to the holy Scripture, finding, that the day of our Redemption was very considerable, yea, much more excellent than that of our Creation, as it appears by the words of Jesus Christ, concerning Judas, *Good* Mark 14. *were it for that man, if he* 21. *had never been born.*

And finding that in the first day of the week, Jesus Christ, *who is the true* Joh. 1. *light which lighteth every*
man

A&A. 2.

man that cometh into the World, came out of the darknes of the Sepulchre, on which day our Redemption appeared more especially and evidently ; and that on the first day of the week, there appeared unto the Apostles cloven Tongues, like as of fire, and sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other Tongues ; and that on this day likewise Christ revealed to St. John, the excellent and admirable Mysteries described in his Revelations ; and that the Apostles did chuse that day for their publick exercises of Piety,

Piety, and Charity, for the administration of Sacraments, and manifestation of the Gospel, as it appears in the *Acts*, and in *Act. 20.*
 the first to the *Corinthians*; *1 Cor. 16.*

I say all this being true, the Church thought they might and ought to imitate the Apostles, and instead of the seventh, ordain the first day of the week to be kept holy.

Object. It is written in the first Epistle of St. Paul to the *Corinthians*, *Not to 1 Cor. 4.6.*
 think of men above that which is written; and in the 15th. Chapter of St. Matthew, *In vain they do Mat. 15. 9.*
 worship me, teaching for Do-
ctrines

Strines the Commandments of men. But the Church of *England* thinks of men above that which is written, and teaches for Doctrines the Commandments of men, as it appears in the *Common-prayer Books*, which are appointed to be read in all their Churches, wherein they enjoyn *The sign of the Cross*, and *God-Fathers* and *God-mothers* in Baptism; it appears also in the *Surplice*, *Musick*, and *Organs*, practised especially in Cathedral Churches. Therefore she is not the holy Catholick Church, because to be so, she ought to believe and practise the whole Christian Faith, with-

without adding to, or diminishing from it.

Ans. The words of St. *Paul* and *Matthew* are to be understood of the Doctrine or points of Faith, that is to say, it is not lawful to any man, in whatever Dignity or Power he is, to establish any Article of Faith, besides what is established in the holy Scripture. Therefore St. *Paul* foreseeing, that men would attribute to themselves a Priviledge belonging to God only, I mean, that they should establish Articles of Faith, not found in the holy Scripture, (as oftentimes the Church of

I *Rome*

Rome doth) curseth them,
and will have them to be
Anathema.

Secondly, I say, when
the Church of *England*
commands and uses Com-
mon-Prayers, she doth not
think of men above that
which is written, nor tea-
ches for Doctrines the
Commandments of men,
because in several places of
the holy Scripture, we have
a Command to pray, yea,
to pray by a form; *For*
when you pray, saith Christ
himself, *pray after this man-*
ner, Our Father which art
in Heaven, &c. and see-
ing that Jesus Christ not
only commands his Dis-
ciples to pray, but also to
pray

Mat. 6. 9.

pray after a Form, which Example they ought to follow in all other Prayers, 'tis a sign that Common-Prayers, which are made according to that form which by our Saviour is set as a Pattern, I mean, which conduce to the Glory of God, and Salvation of Souls, and wherein nothing is found contrary to the holy Scripture, are not only lawful, but ought to be used in Churches, and preferred before *extempore* Prayers. I say, that they ought to be preferred before *extempore* Prayers; First, Because in this sort of Prayers, we may let slip (as it happens

too often) a bad Doctrine, or some points contrary to Faith; and either by inconsideration or ignorance we may ask that which is contrary to the Will of God, and hurtful to our Salvation; and what good effect can a man hope from such Prayers, wherein are found so many Imperfections? But none of these faults are found in Common-Prayers; we are certain, they are Orthodox, and that therein we ask nothing hurtful unto us, nor contrary to the Will of God, they being composed by them who represent the Church, I mean, by a considerable number of

of learned and godly men, who before they commanded them to be used in publick, did seriously consider, whether they were wholly conformable to the Word of God.

Secondly, Because in the Prayer made *extempore*, as Dr. Beveridge did very well observe in his admirable Sermon of the Excellency of the Common-Prayer, *We must first listen to what the Minister will say next, then we are to consider, whether what he saith be agreeable to sound Doctrine, and whether it be proper and lawful for me to joyn with him in the Petitions he puts up to God Almighty.*

Dr. Beveridge.

mighty. And if we think it is so, then we are to do it; but before we can well do that, he is got to another thing; by which means it is very difficult, if not morally impossible, to joyn with him in every thing so regularly as we ought to do. But by a set form of Prayer, all this trouble is prevented for having the Form continually in our mind, being thorowly acquainted with it, fully approving of every thing in it, we have nothing else to do, whilst the words are sounding in our ears, but to move our hearts and our affections suitably to them, to raise up our desires of those good things, which are pray-
ed

ed for, to fix our minds wholly upon God, whilst we are praising of him, and so to employ, quicken, and lift up our whole Souls in performing our Devotions to him.

Thirdly, I confess that there are unlawful Ceremonies. They being either grossly Idolatrous, or else directly conducing to Idolatry, as some are found in the Church of Rome; as to bow before Images, pray and offer Incense unto them. But I must also confess, that there are some lawful, they either conducing to have more respect towards God Almighty, or serving to incite our cold

hearts, and inflame them with the love of God, and heavenly things.

The Ceremonies which are practised in the Church of *England* are lawful, because they are good, and have no other end than the edification of Souls, and to cause in us more and more respect and love towards holy and Celestial things; and are not contrary to the holy Scripture.

That there be lawful Ceremonies, it can't be denied, unless we will condemn the holy Scripture, and the Practice of the Apostles, and of Jesus Christ, who ordained and kept them. Which is manifested

sted by these words, *Now* 1 Cor. 11.2

I praise you brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the Ordinances, as I delivered them to you ; and verse 34. The rest will I set in order when I come.

When ye come together, saith 1 Cor. 14. 26. *the same Apostle, speak-*

ing concerning meeting in Churches, Let all things be done to edifying. And verse 40. Let all things be done decently, and in order.

And what means all this, but that there were Ceremonies used among the first Christians in the Apostles time, proposed by them, whereof no particular mention is made in the holy Scripture?

And to make it plain,
 and remove all doubt, mark
 the following Ceremonies.
 Is not the Ceremony of
 the holy Kiss ordained by
 St. Paul, when he saith,
*Salute one another with an
 holy kiss?* Is not the Cere-
 mony of putting off the
 Hat, commanded to every
 man when he prayeth un-
 to God? *When a man pray-
 eth, saith Paul, he ought
 not to cover his head.* Was
 not the Ceremony of the
 Imposition of hands on
 young Children used by
 Christ himself? As in these
 words, *They brought unto
 him little Children, that he
 should put his hands on them,
 and pray, and the Disciples*
re-

1 Cor.

Mat. 19. 13

Mar. 10. 14

rebuked them; but Jesus said, Suffer little Children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for such is the Kingdom of Heaven, and he laid his hands on them. Was not the Ceremony of washing the feet used by Jesus Christ? He poured Joh. 13. 5. water into a Bason, and be- & v. 14, 15. gan to wash the Disciples feet, and to wipe them with the Towel, wherewith he was girded; and saith, if then your Lord and Master have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one anothers feet, for I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.

Is not the Ceremony of anointing them that are sick, ordained by St. James?

Jam. 5. 14.

When he saith, *Is any sick among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oyl, in the name of the Lord.*

I will not here mention several other Ceremonies used among the first Christians, as to mingle Water with Wine, to signifie that the blood of Christ had a cleansing virtue in it, which Mystery was represented by the Water which flowed with the Blood, from our Saviours side. As to give Milk with Honey to drink unto baptized Persons,

sons, to signifie that they were like new born babes, who ought to desire the sweet and sincere Milk of the Word. And as to stand up in all their Devotions from *Easter* to *Whitsuntide*, to signifie that Christ was risen from the dead; because (though the Instances here mentioned may be sufficient to persuade us to follow their Example in the use of Ceremonies,) those that I have brought out of the holy Scripture ought wholly to convince us.

It is then certain, that there are lawful Ceremonies, which have no other end, than the Glory of God,
the

the Salvation of our Souls, and are not contrary to the Word of God. And that the Ceremonies commanded and practised in the Church of *England* are such, I will make it appear. But, First, We must be certain, though the Church have no Power to establish points of Faith, belonging to God only, as it is the consent of all Divines; yet she hath power to set up Ceremonies, which are necessary, either to the decent administration, or reception of Sacraments; or to make us remember the holiness and purity, which we ought to have, when we are gathered together

gether to sing Psalms unto God, to call upon his holy Name, to beg his Mercies, and give him thanks for all his Favours, or to inflame our hearts, and lift up our minds towards heavenly things. I say, that the Church hath now this Power, since there is but one Catholick Church, and that the same now as was in the Apostles time, and since in the Apostles time, there were Ceremonies, as I have made it appear already, and may clearly be inferred from these words of St. Paul, *let all things be done decently and in order.* For what is it meant thereby, but that the Word of God

God should be preached, his praises sung, his holy Name worshipped and called upon, thanksgivings returned unto him, and his Sacraments administred and received with the Ceremonies established by the Church? Which is evidently inferred from these words, *Decently, and in order*. Therefore since there were Ceremonies in the Church then, it is lawful now to have them; but had there been none in the Apostles time, it doth not follow, that they are forbidden at this. God left Authority enough to his Church to set any, provided, as I have said before, they

they conduce to his Glory,
the Edification of Souls,
and are not contrary to
the holy Scripture. But
the Ceremonies used in the
Church of *England* are
such; therefore they are
lawful. To shew it in par-
ticular.

Doth not the Ceremo-
ny of the sign of the Cross,
used immediately after In-
fants Baptism, conduce to
the Edification of our
Souls? Being to put us in
mind, that we are not to
be ashamed, to confess the
Faith of Christ crucified,
but manfully to fight un-
der his Banner, against sin,
the World, and the Devil;
and to continue Christ's
faithful

faithful Souldiers and Servants unto our lives end. And doth not this conduce to the Glory of God? Seeing we take from thence an occasion to praise and give him thanks for his great love manifested unto us, in sending his only Son into the World, to die upon the Cross, for the redemption of Mankind. And can any body make appear that this is contrary to the Word of God? No, certainly, he which endeavours it, will undoubtedly fail in his undertaking.

Is the Custom of God-Fathers and God-Mothers in Baptism contrary to the Word of God? In what
Chap-

Chapter or Verse is that to be found ? I have read the Scripture over, and I do not remember to have read that it is forbidden. But on the contrary, I find this Custom very good, yea, very necessary; because our spiritual Generation, which is by Baptism, is in some manner like unto our carnal; wherefore it is said, *1 Pet. 2. Laying aside all malice and all guile, as new born babes desire the sincere Milk of the Word.* And as in carnal Generation, a Child newly born wants a Nurse, and a Master to breed him up, so in the spiritual Generation of Baptism, some body is required,

quired, who taking the place of a Nurse and Master, brings up the Child, and instructs him in the Faith of Christian Religion; wherefore because the Ministers cannot do it, being imployed towards the common care of the Souls committed to their Charge, and the Childs Parents may die, before he be grown to Age, and understand what belongs to the Christian Faith, the Church requires God-Fathers, and God-Mothers, that they might receive in their Charge, the Child baptized, and promise to see him brought up to, and understand (as much as is in

in their Power) the Christian Religion.

Is the Custom and Ceremony of standing up in reading Hymns, Psalms, the Gospel, and the Creed; and of kneeling down in making our Prayers unto God, forbidden in the holy Scripture? On the contrary, have we not an Example of Jesus Christ, who prayed upon his knees, saying, *Father, if thou be willing, remove this Cup from me, nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done.*

And when we are standing up in the reading of Psalms and Hymns, it is to shew, that we ought to lift up our mind towards
Hea-

Heaven ; and by our standing at the Creed and Gospel, we give to understand, that we are ready to defend them to the utmost of our Power, against all opposition whatsoever. And doth not this conduce to the Edification of our Souls, and to the Glory of God ?

Is the Custom of wearing the Surplice, of singing, and playing upon Organs, forbidden in any Chapter of the holy Scripture ? If they were, pray inform me where it is. What evil consequence follows therefrom ? Instead of this, doth it not serve to distinguish Lay-man from Clerk,

Clerk, and to cause a greater respect to be given to the things belonging to the Worship of God, and to put him that wears it in mind, that when he cometh to Church to administer divine Service, he ought to be pure in his heart, which is signified unto him by the whiteness of his Surplice, which is the Symbole of Purity. And doth not Musick and Organs, used especially in Cathedral Churches, serve to raise up our minds; to inflame our hearts with the love of God; to lift them up towards Heaven; and to cause them to desire to be for ever in that holy and blef-

Isa. 6. 3.

blessed Company, wherein with an Harmony, that infinitely surpasses our Musick here upon Earth, they sing *Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts, the whole Earth is full of his Glory.*

Psal. 81.

And is it not conformable to several Texts of the holy Scripture, wherein it is said, *Sing aloud unto God our strength, make a joyful noise unto the God of Jacob. Take a Psalm, and bring hither the Timbrel, the pleasant Harp with the Psaltery, blow up the Trumpet.*

Therefore it is clear and certain, that the Ceremonies of the Church of *England* are lawful, they being not contrary to the ho-
ly

ly Scripture, but condu-
 cing to the Glory of God,
 and Edification of our
 Souls. Now because these
 words, *Not to think of men*
above that which is written,
 and these, *In vain they do*
worship me, teaching for Do-
ctrines the Commandments
of men, are not to be un-
 derstood concerning Cere-
 monies, but concerning
 points of Faith; and find-
 ing several Ceremonies used
 among the first Christians,
 even in Christs, and his
 Apostles time, whereof
 some were specified (as I
 have made it appear alrea-
 dy) and some not specifi-
 ed, whereof no particular
 mention is made in the ho-

By Scripture, as it may be inferred from these words of St. Paul, *Let all things be done decently, and in order*; it follows, that the Church of England is the holy Catholick Church, since she believes and practises nothing but what is agreeable to the Christian Doctrine.

It is then without good Reason, that a great many separate themselves from that Church, it being the holy Catholick. For those, who, knowing her to be such, separate themselves from her, are Schismatics, and out of hope of Salvation.

First, I say, that they
 are *Schismatics*, because
 they have not sufficient
 Reason to warrant their
 Separation. For, as saith
Irenæus, *Schismata operan-* *Irenæus,*
tur qui sunt immanes, non *lib. 4. c. 62.*
habentes Dei dilectionem,
suamque utilitatem potius
considerantes, quàm unita-
tem Ecclesiæ, & propter
Modicas, & quolibet cau-
sas magnum & gloriosum
corpus Christi dividant, &
quantum in ipsis est interfi-
ciunt, pacem loquentes &
bellum operantes, verè li-
quantes culicem, & Came-
lum transglutientes. Those
are Schismatics, who are
cruel, having not the love
of God before their eyes, but

rather embracing their own Interest, than the Unity of the Church, and for small and light causes divide the great and glorious Body of Christ, and murder it as much as is in their power; speaking Peace, and making War, straining at a Gnat, and swallowing a Camel. Ceremonies are no points of Faith, therefore he that separates himself because of Ceremonies, separates himself for small and light Causes, and therefore he is a Schismatick; and if he only be Schismatick, who separates himself from the Church for small and light Causes, as saith Irenæus, and is granted by Divines; then

on the other hand, he is no *Sekismatick*, who separates himself for great and weighty Causes, as for Idolatry, and other Articles of Faith, which they will have us to believe, under pain of eternal Damnation, and which are not found in the holy Scripture, or are directly contrary to it. Therefore we separating our selves from thole of the *Roman Church*, for great and weighty Causes, it is manifest, we are not *Schismaticks*; and as no man should separate himself from a Church, for small and light Reasons, so he is bound to separate himself, when he finds e-

K 3 vidently,

2Cor. 6. 17
 Isa. 52. 11.

evidently, that that Church believes and practises Articles of Faith, which are not in the holy Scripture, or are directly contrary to it; which is enjoined unto us by St. Paul, and Isaiah saying, *Come out from among them, and be ye separate. For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what Communion hath light with darkness? And what Concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believes with an Infidel? And what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols?* This is the only lawful Cause of Separation, and for this Cause, we separate

parate our selves from those of the *Roman* Church, or rather they separte themselves from us, for *Schisme* is not to be Imputed unto us, because we believe, and practise nothing in the Church, but what is agreeable to the holy Scripture. Wherefore it may be justly imputed to them, because they do not only believe and practise, but also will have us to believe and practise several Articles of Faith, which are neither distinctly contained in the holy Scripture, nor can be deduced from it by clear and necessary Consequences.

They then that separate themselves from the Church of *England*, because of Ceremonies, do separate themselves for *small* and *light* Causes, and consequently, are *Schismatics*.

Secondly, I say, they are out of hope of Salvation; for as man is composed of a body and spirit; and as his body liveth by his spirit, whilst it is united to the body. So if we will live by the Spirit of Christ, we must be united to Christ's Body; but the Mystical Body of Christ is the Church, therefore they that are separated from the Mystical Body of Christ, cannot

cannot be vivified by the spirit of Christ, and consequently cannot be saved; for those only are saved, that are vivified by the spirit of Christ.

Which is very well represented by the Deluge and Ark of *Noah*, for as all perished temporally by the Deluge, that were not in the Ark, so all shall perish eternally, who are out of the Catholick Church. And as no body could escape drowning, being out of the Ark; so neither shall any escape Damnation out of the Church. And as none of the first born of *Egypt* lived, but such as were within these Habita-

K 5 tions,

tions, whose Door-posts were sprinkled with blood by the appointment of God, for their preservation. And as none of the Inhabitants of *Jericho* could escape the Fire and Sword, but such as were within the House of *Rahab*, for whose Protection a Covenant was made. So none shall ever escape the eternal wrath of God, which is not a Member of the holy Catholick Church. For as

Act. 4. 12

There is no other name under Heaven given among men, whereby we can be saved, but the Name of Jesus. So there is no other Church, wherein we can be saved, but the holy Catholick.

Which

Which is confirmed by the Fathers. Whosoever, saith Chrysostome, divides the unity of the Church, (the mystical Body of our Lord) he shall not incur a less punishment, than those have done, who pierced, mangled, and tore his Body. Sola Catholica Ecclesia est quæ verum cultum retinet. Hic est Fons veritatis, hoc est domicilium fidei; quo si quis non intraverit, vel à quo si quis exierit, à spe vitæ ac salutis æternæ alienus est.

Epist. 152.
ad Rom.
11. in Eph.

Laet. lib. 4.
de vera sap.
& relig.
c. 30.

He shall not have God for his Father, saith Austin, That would not have the Church for his Mother. So the fourth Council of Carthage, declares, that out of the

Aug. de
symb. ad
cathec. l. 4.
c. 10.

conc. cart.
can. 1.

the Catholick Church there is no Salvation. And Ful-

Fulgent. de remiss. peccat. l. 1. c. 22. *gentius* speaks thus, Sicut in Hiericho quisquis extra illam domum fuit, nullum potuit adipisci vite subsidium, sic extra Ecclesiam Catholicam nullus accipiet indulgentiam peccatorum. Extra hanc Ecclesiam nec Christianum nomen aliquem juvat, nec baptismus salvat, nec mundum Deo sacrificium offertur, nec peccatorum remissio accipitur, nec eterna vite felicitas invenitur. As in Hiericho, who-soever was out of that House, could not obtain the benefit of Life, so out of the Catholick Church none shall receive the pardon of sins. Out of
this

this Church, neither the Title of Christian secures any one, neither doth Baptism confer Salvation, neither doth any man offer a Sacrifice agreeable unto God, nor receives the Remission of his sins, nor finds the happiness of Eternal Life. And in

another place, he saith, *Firmissime tene & nullatenus dubites quemlibet Hæreticum sive Schismaticum in nomine Patris & filii & Spiritus sancti baptizatum, si Ecclesiæ Catholicæ non fuerit aggregatus, quantasque eleemosinas fecerit, etsi pro Christi nomine etiam sanguinem fuderit nullatenus posse salvari. Omni enim homini qui Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*

*Idem de fide
ad perr.
Diac. c. 39.*

tholicae non tenet unitatem,
 neque baptismus, neque Ele-
 mosina quaelibet copiosa, ne-
 que mors pro nomine Christi
 suscepta proficere poterit ad
 salutem, quandiu in eo Hæ-
 retica vel Schismatica pravi-
 tas perseverat, quæ ducit ad
 mortem. Hold this most
 firmly, and doubt not of it
 in any wise, that every He-
 retick and Schismatick what-
 soever, baptized in the Name
 of the Father, the Son, and
 the Holy Ghost, if he be not
 reunited to the Catholick
 Church, let him bestow ne-
 ver so many Alms, yea,
 though he should shed his
 blood for the Name of Christ,
 he cannot obtain Salvation.
For neither Baptism, nor
Alms,

Alms, how great soever, nor death suffered for the Name of Christ, shall profit unto Salvation to any man that holds not the Unity of the Catholick Church. If he neglect Mat. 18. 17
to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen man, and a Publican.

Therefore, since those who separate themselves from the holy Catholick Church, are Schismaticks, and out of hope of Salvation, as I have made it appear evidently, the Church of England being the holy Catholick, let now the Reader draw the Conclusion.

I know, what I said just now concerning those who are out of the Catholick Church, will be granted to be true; but, the Reader will object again, the Question is, to know which is the holy Catholick Church; for if we will believe some Fathers, it seems that the most part, yea, none of those that you blame in this Treatise, are out of it. For *Fulgentius* in the place aforementioned, saith, that

Fulg. de remiss. peccat. lib. 1. c. 22.

There is one only Church, which is this, wherein the Trinity is believed one God, of one Nature and Substance; wherein nothing is attributed to the Son, more than to the Holy Ghost; wherein
one

one and the same honour and worship is rendred to the Trinity, who is true God : This is the only true Church, w^hich believing and publishing one Essence in Trinity, dares not esteem one Person above th^o other. Una est Ecclesia, in qua Trinitas unus Deus, unius naturæ atque substantiæ creditur ; in qua nec Filio, nec Spiritui sancto contumelia minorationis ingeritur ; in qua unus atque idem Cultus, & honor unus uni Trinitati quæ Deus verus est exhibetur : Hæc est una vera Ecclesia quæ sic credit & predicat unam Trinitatis Essentiam, ut in tribus unam quamlibet non audeat præferre alteri

ri personam. Athanasius is of that Opinion ; Whosoever, saith he, will be saved, before all things, it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith ; and the Catholick Faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity. And Lactantius saith, *Sola Catholica Ecclesia est, quæ verum cultum retinet.* This is the only Catholick Church, which keeps the true Worship. And three or four times after, he speaks thus, *Quia singuli quique Cætus Hereticorum se potissimum Christianos, & suam esse Ecclesiam Catholicam putant, sciendum est illam esse veram, in qua est Confessio* &

Lactant. de
vera sap. &
rel. lib. 4.
c. 30.

& pœnitentia ; quæ peccata
 & vulnera quibus subiecta
 est imbecillitas carnis, salu-
 briter curat. That is, Be-
 cause every Congregation of
 Hereticks, think to be espe-
 cially Christians, and their
 Church the Catholick, they
 must know, that that Church
 is the true, wherein is Con-
 fession and Repentance, that
 cures the sins and wounds,
 which the weakness of the
 Flesh is subject to. There-
 fore according to Fulgen-
 tius and Athanasius, the
 Arians only are out of the
 Catholick Church ; and
 according to Lactantius,
 we are not able to deter-
 mine any Person out of it :
 Every one pretending to
 keep

Mat. 19.
16.

keep the true Worship, and granting Confession and Repentance to be necessary. Christ himself in his answer to the young man, *What good thing shall I do, that I may have Eternal Life?* Did not bid him to believe in the Trinity, nor in the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father; nor in the Procession of the Holy Ghost, from the Father and the Son, nor in the Incarnation of the Son of God; nor in his Resurrection; nor did tell him that he was to be baptized, or to keep the Sabbath, &c. but, *If thou wilt enter into Life, keep the Command-*

mandments; and the young man having asked him which were they? Jesus specified them unto him, saying, *Thou shalt do no Murther; thou shalt not commit Adultery; thou shalt not Steal; thou shalt not bear false Witness; honour thy Father and thy Mother; and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy self.* If then according to Christs words, he that keeps these Commandments here described, is saved; we must conceive him to be in the Catholick Church, or what some Fathers said, that out of the Catholick Church there is no Salvation, is false. And as in what Sect soever,

soever, every one pretends to keep the true Worship; and by God's Assistance, to perform his Commandments; even so every one pretends to be saved, and consequently, to be in the holy Catholick Church.

I answer, That they are deceived; for when the Fathers said, that the Catholick Church did consist in such and such a thing, as for Example, in the belief of the Trinity, they did not intend to exclude the belief of the other points of Faith, nor the practise of the Commandments enjoined us in the holy Scripture. And Jesus Christ, who saith to the
young

young man, that if he will enter into Life, he must keep the Commandments here mentioned, pronounces *Wo* unto the Authors of Heresies, as unto all Scribes, Pharisees and Hypocrites; will have us to eat his Body, and to drink his Blood; *Except ye eat* Joh. 6. 53. *the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no Life in you*; bids us to be baptized, *Except a man be born of Water and of the Spirit,* Joh. 3. 5. *he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* Besides practice, he desires belief; *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.* Mar. 16. 16

Wherefore it is not enough to say, I thought I
was

was a Member of the Catholick Church, because I thought it did consist in believing and practising such and such things only; our ignorance is not sufficient to excuse us before God; we are bound to inquire after Truth, and the true Worship of God. A wilful and affected ignorance is a double Crime, and we must not believe, because we think we do well, and are Members of the Catholick Church, that this is sufficient to excuse us; this is a mistake, otherwise the Jews should not have been guilty, when they crucified Jesus Christ, because they did it ignorantly,

rantly, and thought they
 acted according to their
 Law, *For had they known* 1 Cor. 2. 8.
it, they would not have cru-
cified the Lord of Glory. We
 could not say that Paul was
 guilty, when breathing out
 threatnings and slaughter
 against the Disciples of the
 Lord, he went unto the
 High-Priest, desiring Let-
 ters from him to *Damascus*
 to the Synagogues, that if
 he found any Christians,
 whether they were men or
 women, he might bring
 them bound to *Hierusalem*.
 Nor when he made ha- v. 8. 3.
 vock of the Church, en-
 tering into every House, and
 haling men and women,
 committing them to Prison.

L

Nor

v. 7. 38.

Serm. 14.
de Sanctis.

Nor when he was consenting unto the death of Stephen, and kept the Cloaths of the Witnesses who stoned him, though *Austin* speaks thus of him; *Ut enim esset in omnium lapidantium manibus, ipse omnium vestimenta servabat, magis sevens omnes adiuvando, quàm suis manibus lapidando.* For he thought he did well, transported by a Zeal which he had for his Law. Neither could we now blame the Papists, when they act so horrid and cruel Tragedies against those that they call Hereticks, for, as I suppose, they think they do a Sacrifice well-pleasing unto God. If
any

any ignorance can excuse a man, it is that which is called Invincible, as that of young Children, and mad People.

Therefore when we live in a Kingdom, wherein Religion there practised is not contrary to the holy Scripture, we are bound to conform unto it. I know that *We had rather obey God* A&. 5. 29. *than men*, but it is when their Commandments are contrary to the Commandments of God ; otherwise we are obliged to obey the Princes and Magistrates which we are subject to ; put them in mind to obey Principalities and Powers, to obey Magistrates, *Tit.*

3. 1. Obeÿ them that have the Rule over you, and submit your selves. *Heb.*

13. 17. Submit your selves to every Ordinance of men, for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King as Supreme, or unto Governors, as unto them that are sent by him, for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well.

1 *Pet.* 2. 13. Let every Soul be subject unto the higher Powers, for there is no Power but of God: The Powers that be, are ordained of God; whosoever therefore resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist, shall receive to themselves

Dam-

Damnation, *Rom. 13. 1, 2.*

Wherefore the holy Powers enjoining us to conform to the Church of *England*, which (as I have made it appear) teaches or practises nothing contrary to the holy Scripture; we are obliged to obey them. Neither do I see, how those that are convinced of what I have here written, and still refuse to obey, can excuse themselves from being Schismatics, and from being out of hope of Salvation. He shall not have God for his Father, who will not have the Church for his Mother. Whosoever resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they

Rom. 13. 2

Aug. de
symb. ad
Cathec.

lib. 4. c. 10.

that resist shall receive to
themselves Damnation. O
*Ecclesia Romana, aut quæ-
cumque sis alia, quid insul-
tas, quid exsufflas, quid eti-
am ad tempus multa usurpas
adversus Ecclesiam Anglica-
nam? Licet hæc doleat, non
te magna metuit sponsa Chri-
sti sancta Catholica Ecclesia;
cum enim respexerit ille spon-
sus, ejicieris tu ut ancilla
cum filiis tuis, quoniam non
erunt hæredes filii ancille,
cum filiis liberæ. O Church
of Rome, or whatsoever o-
ther Church thou art! Why
dost thou boast? Why art thou
puffed up? Why also dost
thou usurp upon the Church
of England? Though she be
sorrowful. yet the great spouse
of*

of Christ, the holy Catholick Church doth not fear thee; for when the Bridegroom looks upon her, then thou shalt be cast out, as the Bond-woman, with thy Children; because the Children of the Bond-woman, shall not be heirs with the Sons of the Free woman.

Although I have made appear, that the Church of England, is the holy Catholick Church, and that all those, who knowing her to be such, and still refuse to conform, are Schismatics, out of hope of Salvation; and shall not be heirs with the Sons of the free-woman, but cast out as the bond-woman with her

Children, yet I am not of that Opinion, that they ought to be persecuted; this Doctrine of Persecution being contrary to the Law of Nature, and to the Doctrine of our Saviour Jesus Christ; *As ye would that all men should do unto you, so do you unto them.* We would not be persecuted for our Religion, therefore we must not persecute others. But the Reader will object, we have a Law, and by our Law they ought to be persecuted; I Answer, if that were a sufficient Reason to warrant Persecution, we could not blame the *Jews*, when they killed the Prophets, and stoned them,
and

and crucified Jesus Christ, who is Heir and Lord over all, and God blessed for ever. For they said, *We have a Law, and by our Law he ought to die.* And we could not blame Queen *Mary*, who by a Law in her days, caused so many to suffer Martyrdome; nor now the Papists, who formerly, and at this very time in *France, Spain and Italy*, establish Cruelty and Oppression by Law.

If any men be Plotters, or contrive any evil against the King or Government, or breed Sedition and Disturbance in the Kingdom, they must suffer according to the Law; but if they be

Tit. 3. 10,
11.

found without Plots, or evil Contrivances, but erring only concerning Religion, they are to be reprov'd and admonish'd, and after the second Admonition rejected, not cast into Prison, or spoiled of their Goods, and the like; if men be in an Error, the Bishops and Ministers ought rather to convince them by the truth, and stop their mouths by sound Doctrine, than to stir the King and his Council to make Laws to imprison them, and take their Estates from them, &c. as it is now practis'd in *France*, against the poor Protestants. But to make them suffer meerly for Religions sake,

sake, I think it is not law-
 ful, it being contrary to the
 Law of Nature, and Christ's
 Doctrine, as it is proved by
 these words of the most
 worthy and learned Dr.
Tillotson, in his most excel-
 lent Sermon preached be-
 fore the honourable House
 of Commons, and printed
 by their Order. Jesus Christ,
 saith he, going to worship
 at *Hierusalem*, because the
Samaritans, who were of
 another Religion, would
 not receive him in his
 Journey, two of his Disci-
 ples, *James* and *John*, pre-
 sently take fire, and out of
 a well-meaning Zeal for
 their Master, and of the
 true God, and of of *Hieru-*
salem,

Salem, the true place of worship, they are immediately for dispatching out of the way these Enemies of God, and Christ, and the true Religion. And to this end, they desire our Saviour to give them Power to call for fire from Heaven to consume them, as *Elias* had done in a like case. But Jesus Christ seeing them in this heat, notwithstanding all the Reasons they pretended for their passion, and for all they sheltered themselves under the great example of *Elias*, doth very calmly, but severely reprove this temper of theirs, saying, *Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of ;*
for

for the Son of man is not come to destroy mens lives, but to save them. Ye own your selves to be my Disciples, but do you consider, what spirit now acts and governs you? Not that surely which my Doctrine designs to mould and fashion you into, which is not a furious and persecuting and destructive spirit, but mild, and gentle and saving, tender of the lives and interest of men, even of those who are our greatest Enemies. You ought to consider, that you are not now under the rough and sower dispensation of the Law, but the calm and peaceable institution of the Gof-

Gospel, to which the spirit of *Elias*, though he was a very good man in his time, would be altogether insuitable. God permitted it then under the imperfect way of Religion, but now under the Gospel, it would be intolerable. No difference of Religion, no pretence of Zeal for God and Christ, can warrant and justify this passionate and fierce, this vindictive and exterminating spirit. This persecuting, killing and destroying one another about Religion, is contrary to Christs Doctrine, for, *He is not come to destroy mens lives, but to save them.* He came not to kill and destroy,

stroy, but for *the healing of the Nations*, for the Salvation and Redemption of mankind, not only from the wrath to come, but from a great part of the evils and miseries of this life.

This spirit of persecution, which our Saviour here reproves in his Disciples, is directly opposite to the main and fundamental Precepts of the Gospel, which command us *to love one another*, and *to love all men*, even our very *Enemies*; and are so far from permitting us to persecute those who hate us, that they forbid us to hate those who persecute us: They require

quire us to be merciful, as our Father which is in Heaven is merciful ; to be kind and tender-hearted, forbearing one another ; if any man have a quarrel against any, even as God for Christs sake hath forgiven us ; and to put on as the Elect of God, bowels of mercy, meekness and long suffering ; and to follow peace with all men, and to shew all meekness to all men. To all which Precepts nothing can be more opposite, than inhumane Cruelties and Persecutions.

Christs great business was to be beneficial to others, to seek and to save that which was lost ; He went about doing good to the Bodies and

and to the Souls of men. He could if he had pleased, by his miraculous Power have confounded his Enemies, and have thundred out death and destruction against all Hereticks and Schismaticks; but intending that his Religion should be propagated in humane ways, and that men should be drawn to the Profession of it by *the bonds of Love*, and by the gentle and peaceable methods of Reason and Perswasion, he gave no Example of a furious Zeal, and religious Rage against those who despised his Doctrine. When he went about making Profelytes, he offered violence to no man, only

ly said, *If any man will be my Disciple, if any man will come after me.* And when his Disciples were leaving him, he doth not (as the Church of Rome) set up an Inquisition to torture and punish them for their defection from the Faith; only says, *Will ye also go away?*

And in Imitation of this blessed Pattern, the Christian Church continued to speak and act for several Ages. And this was the Language of the holy Fathers, *Lex nova non se vindicat ultore gladio. The Christian Law doth not avenge it self by the Sword.* This was then the Style of Councils, *Ne-*
mini ad credendum vim in-
ferre

Greg. ad
Episc. con-
stantinop.

ferre. To offer Violence to no man to compel him to Faith, and Gregory saith, Nova & inaudita prædicatio, quæ verberibus exigit fidem.

And indeed if Hereticks and Schismatics from the holy Catholick Church were to be persecuted, the *Samaritans*, who were both Hereticks and Schismatics, and had affronted our Saviour himself in his own Person, the honour of God, and of that Religion which he had set up in the World, ought certainly to be punished; so that if ever it were warrantable to put on this fierce and furious Zeal, here was a case that seemed to require it; but even in
these

these Circumstances, Jesus Christ thinks fit to rebuke and discountenance this spirit, *Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.* And he gives such a Reason, as ought in all differences of Religion, how wide soever they be, to deter men from this temper. For, saith he, *The Son of man is not come to destroy mens lives, but to save them;* that is, this spirit is utterly inconsistent with the great design of Christian Religion, and the end of Christs coming into the World.

What then hath the Church of *Rome*, or any other whatsoever, to plead for her Persecution to men
for

for the cause of Religion,
 which *James* and *John*
 might not much better
 have pleaded for themselves
 in their Case against the
Samaritans? Does she pra-
 ctise these severities out of
 a Zeal for truth, and for the
 honour of God, and Christ,
 and the true Religion?
 Upon these very accounts
 it was, that *James* and *John*
 would have called for fire
 from Heaven to have de-
 stroyed the *Samaritans*. Is
 the Church of *Rome*, or any
 other whatsoever perswa-
 ded, that those whom she
 persecutes are Hereticks
 and Schismaticks, and that
 no Punishment can be too
 great for such Offenders?

So

So *James* and *John* were
 perswaded of the *Samaritans*,
 and upon much better
 grounds: For they had
 some Excuse in their Case,
 which the Church of *Rome*
 hath not; and that was ig-
 norance: And this Apologie
 Jesus Christ makes for them,
saying, Ye know not what
manner of spirit ye are of. But
 in the Church of *Rome*, or
 in any other Christian
 Church whatsoever, what-
 ever the Case of particular
 Persons may be, as to the
 whole Church, and the go-
 verning part of it, this ig-
 norance is wilful and affe-
 cted, and therefore inexcus-
 able. For the Christian Re-
 ligion, which they profess
 to

to embrace, doth as plainly teach the contrary, as it doth any other matter whatsoever : And it is not more evident in the New Testament, that Christ dyed for sinners, than that Christians should not persecute and destroy one another for the mis-belief of any Article of revealed Religion ; much less for the dis-belief of such Articles as are invented by men, or are imposed as only Ceremonies.

Those whom we call Hereticks and Schismatics, saith *Salvian*, do not think they are so. *They are Hereticks and Schismatics in our Opinion, but in their own they are not : For they think they*
are

Salu.

are Catholicks, in as much as they call us Hereticks ; therefore what they are to us, we are to them. *Hæretici sunt, sed non scientes apud nos sunt hæretici, apud se non sunt, nam in tantum se Catholicos esse judicant, ut nos ipsos titulo hæreticæ pravitatis infamant. Quod ergo illi nobis sunt, & hoc nos illis.* Therefore as we would not have them to persecute us for our Religion, so we ought not to persecute them for theirs, As ye would that all men should do unto you, so do you unto them.

F I N I S.

